arXiv:1609.06760v2 [math.RT] 27 Sep 2016

THE PERIPLECTIC BRAUER ALGEBRA

KEVIN COULEMBIER

Abstract. We study the periplectic Brauer algebra introduced by Moon in the study of invariant theory for periplectic Lie superalgebras. We determine when the algebra is quasi-hereditary and, for fields of characteristic zero, describe the block decomposition. To achieve this, we also develop theories of Jucys-Murphy elements, Bratteli diagrams, Murphy bases, determine when there exist quasi-hereditary 1-covers, obtain a BGG reciprocity relation and determine some decomposition multiplicities of cell modules. As an application, we determine the blocks in the category of finite dimensional weight modules over the periplectic Lie superalgebra.

1. Introduction

In [Mo], Moon introduced algebras A_n for all positive integers n, bearing resemblance to Brauer algebras. Brauer algebras $B_n(\delta)$ appear naturally in invariant theory of Lie (super)algebras preserving an *even* bilinear form, *viz.* orthogonal and symplectic Lie algebras and, more generally, orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras, see e.g. [BSR, ES, LZ2, Se2]. Similarly, the algebra A_n was introduced to study the invariant theory for a Lie superalgebra preserving and *odd* bilinear form, known as the periplectic, or strange or peculiar, Lie superalgebra.

The algebra A_n hence acts as an odd analogue of $B_n(0)$. This was made explicit by Kujawa and Tharp in [KT] and by Serganova in [Se2]. It is pointed out in [KT, Se2] that A_n, contrary to $B_n(\delta)$, fails to be cellular in the sense of [GL], in any obvious way. Acquiring better understanding of the structure of A_n is essential for the study of the representation theory of the periplectic superalgebra, which is the least understood of all classical Lie superalgebras. This is our main motivation to study A_n and we already apply our results to solve the long-standing open problem of describing linkage in the category of finite dimensional modules over the periplectic superalgebra.

We study several aspects of the ring-theoretic behaviour and representation theory of the periplectic Brauer algebra A_n. Despite the resemblance to other diagram algebras such as Iwahori-Hecke, Brauer, Temperley-Lieb and BMW algebras, there are some peculiarities of the periplectic Brauer algebra which complicate its study. As already mentioned, A_n is not cellular. Furthermore we demonstrate that, as can be expected through its connection with periplectic Lie superalgebras, the centre is very small. Finally, the periplectic Brauer algebra is not part of a family of algebras which are generically semisimple. Alternatively, there is no logical realisation of A_n as the specialisation of a semisimple algebra over a ring.

Now we review the main results on A_n which will be obtained in this paper. Consider an algebraically closed field $\Bbbk$ of characteristic $p \geq 0$. We use the sets

$$\mathcal{J}^0(n) := \{n, n-2, \dots, t'_n\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{J}(n) := \{n, n-2, \dots, t_n\},$$

where $t_n = t'_n = 1$ if n is odd, while $t_n = 0$ and $t'_n = 2$ when n is even.

Theorem 1 (Block decomposition)**.** *The simple modules of A_n are labelled by the set Λ_A of p-restricted partitions of i, for all $i \in \mathcal{J}^0(n)$. Assume $p \notin [2, n]$, the simple modules $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ belong to the same block if and only if λ and μ have the same 2-core. An equivalent condition is that the number of even minus the number of odd contents of λ equals that of μ.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16G10, 17B10, 20C05, 81R05.

Key words and phrases. marked Brauer category, diagram algebra, quasi-hereditary algebras and covers, Jucys-Murphy elements, periplectic Lie superalgebra, block decomposition, standard systems, Murphy bases.

Note that the labelling of simple modules by Λ_A is originally due to Kujawa and Tharp, see [KT, Theorem 4.3.1], but we find a different proof.

Theorem 2 (Quasi-heredity)**.** *If n is odd and $p \notin [2,n]$, the algebra $(A_n, \leq)$ is quasi-hereditary, in the sense of* [CPS]*. Here, $\leq$ is the partial order on Λ_A determined by $\mu < \lambda$ if and only if $|\lambda| < |\mu|$.*

The algebra A_2 is hereditary and hence quasi-hereditary for any partial order. However, this is expected to be an exception, as we show that A_4 is already of infinite global dimension.

Even though the periplectic Brauer algebras are not cellular, we prove they have an interesting standardly based structure, which is a weaker notion introduced in [DuR]. In particular, the cell modules almost always form a standard system, in analogy with the result of Kleshchev and Nakano in [KN] for symmetric groups.

Theorem 3 (Cell modules)**.** *The algebra A_n is standardly based for $\mathbf{L}_A := \sqcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} \{\lambda \,|\, \lambda \vdash i\}$. The cell modules $\{W(\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \mathbf{L}_A\}$ form a standard system if and only if $p \notin \{2,3\}$ and $n \notin \{2,4\}$.*

Assume that $p \notin [2,n]$ and $n \notin \{2,4\}$, the (uniquely defined) multiplicities in the cell filtration of the projective covers satisfy

$$(P(\mu) : W(\lambda)) \;=\; [W(\lambda') : L(\mu')], \qquad \text{for } \; \mu \in \Lambda_A \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \in L_A.$$

where λ' and μ' denote the transpose partitions.

When A_n is quasi-hereditary, we have $\mathbf{L}_A = \Lambda_A$ and the cell and standard modules coincide.

By [CZ, Lemma 5.3.1], the statement that the cell modules constitute a standard system implies that A_n admits a quasi-hereditary 1-cover, in the sense of [Ro]. We construct this cover if $p \notin [2,n]$, the general case will be considered elsewhere.

Theorems 1, 2 and 3 and other results in the paper lift the knowledge of the periplectic Brauer algebras, concerning quasi-heredity, standardly based structures, block decomposition, Jucys-Murphy elements and Bartelli diagrams to the same level as that of the ordinary Brauer algebra. For $\mathcal{B}_n(\delta)$, the corresponding structures were successfully investigated in [CDM, En, HP, GL, LR, KX, Na].

The final main result is an application to the representation theory of the periplectic Lie superalgebra, which completes a recent partial result by Chen in [Ch].

Theorem 4. *The category of finite dimensional modules over $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$ contains precisely $m+1$ blocks.*

We also find an explicit description of which simple modules are contained in each block. The block decompositions for all other classical Lie superalgebras are known. The periplectic case is complicated by the vanishing of the centre of the universal enveloping algebra, see [Go], which explains why this result was not established earlier. This is also the only case for which there are only finitely many blocks.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the periplectic Brauer algebra and category following [KT] and fix some conventions for symmetric groups. In Section 3 we introduce an algebra in the periplectic Brauer category which we can easily study using the general theory of [CZ]. In Section 4 we show that the algebra of Section 3 is closely related to the periplectic Brauer algebra, by a double centraliser property, which allows to obtain the results in Theorems 2 and 3 above. In Section 5 we study the iterative restriction of cell modules from A_n to A_{n-1}, leading to a Bratteli diagram. Then we define the Murphy basis of the cell modules in terms of this Bratteli diagram. In Section 6 we introduce mutually commuting elements in A_n, which we call the Jucys-Murphy elements. We use these to study the centre of A_n and show that their action on the Murphy basis adheres to the general theory of families of JM elements developed in [Ma2]. This allows to prove one direction of the claim in Theorem 1. In Section 7 we determine some decomposition multiplicities which allow to conclude the proof of Theorem 1. In Section 8 we determine the blocks in the category of finite dimensional weight modules over the periplectic Lie superalgebra, yielding Theorem 4. We also give some interpretations of other results in the paper.

Finally, in Section 9 determine all decomposition multiplicities for A_n with $n \leq 5$ and the path algebra description for $n < 5$. We briefly investigate Koszul and Ringel duality for these examples.

2. Preliminaries

We set $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. Throughout the paper, we let $\Bbbk$ be an arbitrary *algebraically closed* field. By an algebra, we mean an algebra over $\Bbbk$ which is associative, finite dimensional and has an identity element 1 for multiplication. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, modules are assumed to be finite dimensional, unital and left modules. The category of such modules over A is denoted by A-mod. The isoclasses of simple modules are labelled by $\Lambda = \Lambda_A$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we write $L(\lambda)$ or $L_A(\lambda)$ for the corresponding simple module and $P(\lambda) = P_A(\lambda)$ for its projective cover in A-mod. For a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded object V, the degree j part is $V_{(j)}$. For any A-module M, we denote by $\mathcal{F}(M)$ the category of modules admitting a filtration where the sections are direct summands of M.

2.1. **The periplectic Brauer category.** In this section, we introduce the *periplectic Brauer category* $\mathcal{A}$, following [KT]. This is a $\Bbbk$-linear small skeletal category.

2.1.1. The periplectic Brauer category $\mathcal{A}$ is an analogue of the Brauer category $\mathcal{B}(\delta)$ of [De, LZ1] at $\delta = 0$. In fact, when $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 2$, the two coincide. The category $\mathcal{A}$ has been introduced as $\mathrm{Rep}_0 P$ in [Se2, §4.5], and independently as the "marked Brauer category" $\mathcal{B}(0, \text{-}1)$ in [KT, §3].

2.1.2. *Objects and morphisms.* The set of objects of the periplectic Brauer category $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbb{N}$. The $\Bbbk$-vector space $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(i, j)$ is spanned by all (i, j)-*Brauer diagrams* of [LZ1, Definition 2.1]. These diagrams correspond to all partitions of a set of $i+j$ dots into pairs. They are graphically represented by imagining the i dots on a horizontal line and the j dots on a second horizontal line, above the first one. The Brauer diagram then consists of $(i+j)/2$ lines, connecting the dots belonging to the same pair. An example of a $(6, 8)$-Brauer diagram is given below.

The lines in Brauer diagrams which connect the lower and upper horizontal line will be referred to as *propagating lines*. Lines connecting two points on the lower line are called *caps* and lines connecting two points on the upper line are *cups*.

The composition of two morphisms is the 'usual one' in [LZ1, Definition 2.3], up to a possible minus sign. These minus signs originate firstly because the cups and caps are 'odd' morphisms, so they only commute up to a minus sign and, secondly, the caps are anti-symmetric, see [KT] or Section 8.1. This implies that one will need to keep track of the 'relative order' of cups and caps, as well as assign a 'direction' to caps. This is made concrete in the next subsection.

2.1.3. *Marked diagrams.* For a Brauer diagram, we will choose a linear order on all the cups and caps. Further, we will declare any cap to be either left-handed or right-handed.

Graphically, this is achieved by *marking* the Brauer diagram. Any cup is marked with a diamond $\Diamond$ and any cap with a left $\lhd$ or right $\rhd$ arrow, where left means against the sense of moving from the left dot to the right along the line. The relative latitude of these markings is then the graphical realisation of the linear order on the set of cups and caps, where the maximal cup/cap in the order corresponds to the highest marking. This implies that we do not allow two symbols to be on the same latitude. The result is a *marked Brauer diagram*.

An example of a marked Brauer diagram, for the Brauer diagram of 2.1.2 is given below.

Given a Brauer diagram, we define a *standard order* on the set of cups and caps. For this, all cups are bigger than all caps; a cup is bigger than another cup if its left-most dot is to the left of the left-most dot of the other one; a cap is bigger than another cap if its left-most dot is to the right of the left-most dot of the other one. The *standard marking* then corresponds to this standard order together with the choice that every cap is marked by a right arrow. The standard marking for the Brauer diagram in 2.1.2 is given below.

2.1.4. *Composition of morphisms.* Now consider a (j,k)-Brauer diagram d_1 and an (i,j)-Brauer diagram d_2. We will define their composition $d_1 \circ d_2$ as a morphism in $\mathcal{A}$. We create a diagram $d_1 * d_2$, by drawing d_1 on top of d_2 and identifying the j dots on the lower line of d_1 with those on the upper line of d_2. If the corresponding diagram contains any closed loops, we set $d_1 \circ d_2 = 0$. If there are no closed loops, $d_1 * d_2$ can be identified with a partitioning into pairs of $i+k$ dots, so an (i,k)-Brauer diagram. Then we set $d_1 \circ d_2 = (-1)^{\gamma(d_1,d_2)} d_1 * d_2$, where $\gamma(d_1,d_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ will be defined using marked diagrams.

We equip d_1 and d_2 with their standard marking, which gives some decoration of $d_1 * d_2$ obtained by keeping the (relative) latitude of all markings fixed. We can turn this decoration into a marking by using two types of operations: (i) flipping the latitudes of two markings in adjacent vertical position and (ii) cancelling a diamond with an arrow which are on the same line with no other markings between them on the line or vertically. We sum the number of operations of the first type and the number of operations of the second type where the arrow points away from the diamond, and call this number $\gamma^1(d_1,d_2) \in \mathbb{N}$. After these operations, we have obtained a marked Brauer diagram, which is not necessarily in standard form. We define $\gamma^2(d_1,d_2)$ as the sum of the number of left-handed arrows and the length of the permutation which brings the order of the cups and caps into the standard order. Then we have $\gamma(d_1,d_2) := \gamma^1(d_1,d_2) + \gamma^2(d_1,d_2)$. An example of this procedure is given in [KT, Figure 1].

Clearly, the identity morphism of $i \in \mathrm{Ob}\mathcal{A}$ is represented by the diagram with i non-intersecting propagating lines. We denote this isomorphism by e_i^*.

2.1.5. *The periplectic Brauer algebra.* The algebras of [Mo] are obtained as the endomorphism algebras in $\mathcal{A}$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, we define the *periplectic Brauer algebra* as

$$A_n := \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(n).$$

We can of course also define $A_i = \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \cong \Bbbk$ for $i \in \{0,1\}$, but unless included explicitly we do not consider these cases. This allows for easier formulation of precise statements.

A definition of A_n in terms of generators and relations is given in [Mo, Definition 2.2], [Se2, §3.5] and [KT, §4.1]. In particular, A_n is generated by the simple reflections $s_i \in \mathbb{S}_n$, for $i \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}$, where s_i interchanges the dots in positions i and $i+1$ from the left, and any diagram with precisely one cup and cap. We also introduce $\varepsilon_i \in A_n$, for $i \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}$, as

$\varepsilon_i :=$ 

where we have $i-1$ propagating lines to the left of the cup. We denote by $(j,i) \in \mathbb{S}_n \subset A_n$ the elementary permutation, exchanging i and j, and by $\overline{(j,i)} \in A_n$ the Brauer diagram containing only non-crossing propagating lines, except for one cup and cap, both connecting the ith and jth dot from the left. In particular, $(i,i+1) = s_i$ and $\overline{(i,i+1)} = \varepsilon_i$.

2.1.6. *Tensor category.* It is proved in [KT, Theorem 3.2.1] that $\mathcal{A}$ is a strict $\Bbbk$-linear tensor category and is generated by four morphisms (diagrams). These are

(1) I, the identity morphism of $1 \in \mathrm{Ob}\mathcal{A}$, represented by a straight line;
(2) X, the endomorphism of $2 \in \mathrm{Ob}\mathcal{A}$ corresponding to the generator of $\mathbb{S}_2$;
(3) $\cup$, the unique diagram in $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(0,2)$; and
(4) $\cap$, the unique diagram in $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(2,0)$.

The explicit relations are given in [KT, Theorem 3.2.1].

Using that result, we can define, by checking the consistency with the relations, the unique contravariant equivalence of tensor categories $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$, corresponding to

$$I \mapsto I, \quad X \mapsto -X, \quad \cup \mapsto - \cap \quad \text{and} \quad \cap \mapsto \cup.$$

By contravariant equivalence of tensor categories we understand that $\varphi(\alpha \circ \beta) = \varphi(\beta) \circ \varphi(\alpha)$, but $\varphi(\alpha \otimes \beta) = \varphi(\alpha) \otimes \varphi(\beta)$, for morphisms α and β.

This equivalence restricts to the involutive algebra anti-automorphism of A_n, mentioned in [Se2, Section 3.5] and [KT, Lemma 4.1.2(2)]. However, φ differs from the endofunctor in [KT, Proposition 3.4.1(3)], which is contravariant in a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded sense.

2.1.7. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, we fix throughout the paper the embedding $A_k \hookrightarrow A_n$ by mapping a (k,k)-Brauer diagram d to the (n,n)-Brauer diagram $d \otimes e^*_{n-k}$.

2.2. **Quasi-hereditary algebras and standard systems.** An algebra A with some partial order $\leq$ on Λ will be denoted as $(A, \leq)$.

Definition 2.2.1 ([CPS]). The algebra $(A, \leq)$ is *quasi-hereditary* if there are modules $\{\Delta(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ in A-mod, such that

- we have $[\Delta(\lambda) : L(\lambda)] = 1$ and $[\Delta(\lambda) : L(\mu)] = 0$ unless $\mu \leq \lambda$,
- there is a surjection $P(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \Delta(\lambda)$, such that the kernel has a filtration where the section are isomorphic to modules $\Delta(\nu)$ for $\lambda < \nu$.

The modules $\Delta(\lambda) = \Delta_A(\lambda)$ will be referred to as the *standard modules*.

2.2.2. For an arbitrary algebra A, we have a contravariant equivalence of categories

$$\Upsilon : A\text{-mod} \ \to \ A^{\mathrm{op}}\text{-mod}, \qquad M \mapsto M^* = \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk}(M, \Bbbk).$$

If A admits an anti-algebra automorphism ϕ, we obtain a contravariant equivalence of categories

$$\Upsilon_\phi : A\text{-mod} \ \to \ A\text{-mod}, \qquad M \mapsto M^* = \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk}(M, \Bbbk), \tag{2.1}$$

where the action of $a \in A$ on $\alpha \in M^*$ is given by

$$(a\alpha)(v) \ = \ \alpha(\phi(a)v), \qquad \text{for all } v \in M.$$

2.2.3. An algebra A is quasi-hereditary if and only if A^{op} is, see [CPS]. Under Υ^{-1}, the standard modules of A^{op} are mapped to the costandard modules $\{\nabla(\mu) \,|\, \mu \in \Lambda\}$ of A. These satisfy

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(\Delta(\lambda), \nabla(\mu)) \ = \ \delta_{\lambda,\mu}\Bbbk, \qquad \text{for all } \ \delta, \mu \in \Lambda, \tag{2.2}$$

see [DR, Lemma 1.2]. By [DR, Lemma 2.5], we have the general BGG reciprocity relation

$$(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) \ = \ [\nabla(\mu) : L(\lambda)]. \tag{2.3}$$

2.2.4. Consider an abelian $\Bbbk$-linear category $\mathcal{C}$ and a partially ordered set $(S, \leq)$. A *standard system in $\mathcal{C}$ for S* is a set of objects $\{X(\alpha) \,|\, \alpha \in S\}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, such that for all $\alpha, \beta \in S$:

(1) $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X(\alpha)) = \Bbbk$;
(2) $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X(\alpha), X(\beta)) = 0$ unless $\alpha \leq \beta$;
(3) $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{C}}(X(\alpha), X(\beta)) = 0$ unless $\alpha < \beta$.

For a quasi-hereditary algebra $(A, \leq)$, the standard modules $\{\Delta(\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ form a standard system in A-mod for $(\Lambda, \leq)$, see *e.g.* [DR].

2.3. **Standardly based algebras.** As observed in [KT, Se2], A_n fails to be cellular by lack of a suitable involution. Omitting this involution in the definition of cellular algebras in [GL, Definition 1.1] leads to the concept of standardly based algebras in [DuR, Definition 1.1.2].

2.3.1. A standardly based algebra A has a special basis in terms of a poset $(\mathbf{L}, \trianglelefteq)$. The algebra A admits (left) *cell modules* $W_A(\alpha) = W(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{L}$, introduced as 'standard modules' in [DuR, §2.1].

By [DuR, Theorem 2.4.1], Λ can be naturally identified with a subset of $\mathbf{L}$. We consider Λ as a poset for the inherited partial order from $\mathbf{L}$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda \subset \mathbf{L}$, we have furthermore

$$[W(\lambda) : L(\lambda)] = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad [W(\lambda) : L(\mu)] = 0 \quad \text{unless } \mu \trianglelefteq \lambda.$$

By [DuR, Proposition 2.4.4], every indecomposable projective module $P(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in \Lambda$ has a filtration with sections given by modules $W(\alpha)$, with $\alpha \in \mathbf{L}$, such that

$$(P(\lambda) : W(\lambda)) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad (P(\lambda) : W(\alpha)) = 0 \quad \text{unless } \alpha \trianglerighteq \lambda.$$

Note that, in general, the above multiplicities depend on the chosen filtration, see e.g. Section 9.1.

2.3.2. Hence, if $\mathbf{L} = \Lambda$, the standardly based algebra is quasi-hereditary with standard modules $W(\lambda)$. Conversely, every quasi-hereditary algebra is standardly based for $\mathbf{L} = \Lambda$ (as posets) and $W(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)$, by [DuR, Theorem 4.2.3].

2.4. **Partitions and Young diagrams.** We review some basic combinatorics of partitions and Young diagrams, to fix the conventions that we will follow.

2.4.1. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots) \,|\, \lambda \vdash n\},$$

the set of partitions of n. For a partition $\lambda \vdash n$, we set $|\lambda| = n$. The partial order $\trianglelefteq$ on $\mathcal{P}_n$ is the dominance order. We extend the dominance order to a partial order on the set of partitions of all numbers, $\sqcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}_i$, by setting

$$\mu \trianglelefteq \lambda \;\Leftrightarrow\; \begin{cases} |\mu| > |\lambda| & \text{or} \\ |\mu| = |\lambda| \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j \;\leq\; \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j, \qquad \forall\, k. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

2.4.2. For any partition λ, we let λ' denote the transpose. In particular, we have $\mu \trianglelefteq \lambda$ if and only if $\lambda' \trianglelefteq \mu'$. For $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, a partition λ is p-restricted if $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} < p$ for all i. Any partition is 0-restricted. We denote the set of p-restricted partitions by $\mathcal{P}^p_n$.

2.4.3. We will identify a partition with its Young diagram. For instance, the partition $(3,1)$ is represented by the diagram $\ydiagram{3,1}$. Each box or node in the diagram has coordinates (i,j), meaning that the box is in row i and column j. The above diagram has boxes with coordinates $(1,1)$, $(1,2)$, $(1,3)$ and $(2,1)$. The content of a box b in position (i,j) in a Young diagram is $\mathrm{con}(b) := j - i \in \mathbb{Z}$. For a fixed field $\Bbbk$, we define the residue $\mathrm{res}(b) \in \Bbbk$ of a box b as the image of $\mathrm{con}(b)$ under the ring morphism $\bar{\cdot} : \mathbb{Z} \to \Bbbk$ which sends $1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ to $1 \in \Bbbk$. For a partition λ we also define $|\mathrm{res}(\lambda)| \in \Bbbk$ as the sum of all residues of the boxes in λ.

2.4.4. Define the set $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \vdash t$ as the subset of $\mathcal{P}_{t-1}$ of all partitions which can be obtained by removing one box in the Young diagram of λ. Similarly, $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ consists of all partitions of $t+1$ which can be obtained by adding a box to the Young diagram of λ. We will write explicitly $\mu = \lambda \cup b$, if μ is a partition for which its Young diagram can be obtained by adding the box b to λ.

2.5. **Representations of the symmetric group.** Let $\mathbb{S}_t$ be the symmetric group on t symbols.

2.5.1. For the algebra $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_t$, and any partition $\lambda \vdash t$, we consider the *dual Specht module* $W^0(\lambda)$, following [Ma1, §3.2]. When λ is p-restricted, with $p = \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)$, $W^0(\lambda)$ has simple top $L^0(\lambda)$ and the latter exhaust all isoclasses of simple $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_t$-modules irredundantly.

2.5.2. More precisely, the group algebra $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_t$ of the symmetric group on t symbols is cellular and hence standardly based, see [GL, Example 1.2] or [Ma1, Chapter 3]. For $p := \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)$, we have

$$\mathbf{L} = (\mathcal{P}_t, \trianglelefteq) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda = \mathcal{P}_t^p \subseteq \mathbf{L}.$$

For each $\alpha \vdash t$, the cell module is $W^0(\alpha)$. When $p \notin [2,t]$, the algebra $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_t$ is semisimple and then we have $\mathcal{P}_t^p = \mathcal{P}_t$ and $L^0(\lambda) = W^0(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \vdash t$.

The following proposition, stated as [CZ, Lemma 8.4.6], is due to Kleshchev and Nakano [KN].

Proposition 2.5.3. *The modules $\{W^0(\lambda)\}$ form a standard system for $(\mathcal{P}_t, \trianglelefteq)$ if and only if*

$$\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\} \quad \textit{or} \quad \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 3 \ \textit{and} \ t = 2.$$

2.5.4. Let $\psi : \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_t \to \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_t$ denote the algebra anti-automorphism given by $w \mapsto (-1)^{l(w)} w^{-1}$, for all $w \in \mathbb{S}_t$ of length $l(w)$. Under the corresponding equivalence Υ_ψ of equation (2.1) we have

$$\Upsilon_\psi \left(W^0(\lambda) \right) \ \cong \ W^0(\lambda'), \quad \text{for all } \lambda \vdash t, \tag{2.5}$$

see e.g. [Ma1, Ex. 3.14(iii)].

2.5.5. Consider two partitions $\lambda \vdash a$ and $\nu \vdash b$ and a field $\Bbbk$ with $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 0$ or $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) > a+b$. Then there must be some $c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathbb{N}$ for which

$$\mathrm{Ind}^{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{a+b}} L^0(\lambda) \otimes L^0(\mu) \ \cong \ \bigoplus_{\nu \vdash a+b} L^0(\nu)^{\oplus c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}}.$$

The multiplicities $c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}$ are known as the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. By Frobenius reciprocity, the same coefficients appear, for any $\nu \vdash a+b$, as

$$\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_a \times \mathbb{S}_b} L^0(\nu) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash a, \mu \vdash b} \left(L^0(\lambda) \otimes L^0(\mu) \right)^{\oplus c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}}.$$

The coefficients $c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}$ are determined by the Littlewood-Richardson rule (LR rule), see [Ja, §16].

3. The covers C_n

3.1. **Definition.** For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, we define the $\Bbbk$-algebra

$$C_n := \bigoplus_{i,j \in \mathcal{J}(n)} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(i,j),$$

with $\mathcal{J}(n) := \{n, n-2, \ldots, t_n\}$, where $t_n = 0$ if n is even and $t_n = 1$ if n is odd.

3.2. **Main theorems on C_n.** We assume $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and set $p := \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)$.

Theorem 3.2.1. *The isoclasses of simple C_n-modules are labelled by $\Lambda_{C_n} := \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} \mathcal{P}_i^p$.*

Theorem 3.2.2. *Assume $p \notin [2,n]$. The algebra $(C_n, \leq)$ is quasi-hereditary, for partial order $\leq$ on Λ given by $\mu < \lambda$ if and only if $|\mu| > |\lambda|$. The following BGG reciprocity relation holds:*

$$(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) \;=\; [\Delta(\mu') : L(\lambda')], \quad \text{for } \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_C. \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 3.2.3. *Set $\mathbf{L}_{C_n} := \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} \mathcal{P}_i$, with partial order $\trianglelefteq$ of equation (2.4).*

(1) The algebra C_n is standardly based for $(\mathbf{L}_C, \trianglelefteq)$.
(2) The cell modules form a standard system for $(\mathbf{L}_C, \trianglelefteq)$ if and only if $p \notin \{2,3\}$ or $p = 2 = n$.

The following sections are devoted to the proofs of the three theorems. We assume n fixed and write C for C_n

3.3. **The triangular decomposition of C.** We define three subalgebras of C.

- The subalgebra H is spanned by all diagrams with only propagating lines.
- The algebra N^+ is spanned by all diagrams which consists only of caps and non-crossing propagating lines.
- The algebra N^- is spanned by all diagrams which consists only of cups and non-crossing propagating lines.

3.3.1. We clearly have

$$H \;=\; \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} He_i^* \;\cong\; \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} \Bbbk \mathbb{S}_i. \tag{3.2}$$

Thus, by 2.5.1, the simple modules of H are naturally labelled by Λ_C and we denote the simple H-modules by $L^0(\lambda)$.

3.3.2. We consider a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading on C, as $C_{(j)} = \bigoplus_i e_i^* C e_{i+j}^*$. We set

$$C_+ := \bigoplus_{j>0} C_{(j)} \;\text{ and }\; C_- := \bigoplus_{j<0} C_{(j)},$$

and use similar notation for any subalgebra of C. We set $B := HN^+$ and $\overline{B} := N^- H$. It is easily checked that these are subalgebras, with $B_- = 0 = \overline{B}_+$ and $B_{(0)} = H = \overline{B}_{(0)}$.

Lemma 3.3.3. *For the subalgebra B of C, we have that*

(1) $C = B \oplus C_- B$;
(2) $C = N^- B$;
(3) B is projective as a left H-module;
(4) C is projective as a right B-module.

Proof. The subspace B of C is spanned by all diagrams without cups and the subspace $C_- B$ is spanned by all diagrams with at least one cup. This proves claim (1).

We can decompose any diagram d as the product $d_1 d_2 d_3$ of three diagrams. We let d_1 be made out of all the cups of d and non-crossing propagating lines, starting in the remaining dots on the upper line of d_1. The diagram d_3 is similarly defined as the diagram containing the caps of d_3. Finally, d_2 is the unique diagram consisting solely of propagating lines such that $d = d_1 d_2 d_3$. This implies part (2). Furthermore, to each diagram we can associate the number of propagating lines. This leads to a decomposition

$$C = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} N^- e_i^* B.$$

For any diagram d in $N^- e_i^*$ we have $dB \cong e_i^* B$, proving that C_B is projective. Similarly it follows that for any diagram d in $e_i^* B$ we have $Hd \cong He_i^*$, which concludes the proof. $\square$

The reasoning in the proof of Lemma 3.3.3 has the following consequence.

Corollary 3.3.4. *Multiplication provides an isomorphism*

$$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{n} N^{-}e_i^* \otimes e_i^* H \otimes e_i^* N^{+} \;\tilde{\to}\; C.$$

3.3.5. In the terminology of [CZ, Definition 3.2.3], Lemma 3.3.3 states that B is a graded pre-Borelic subalgebra of C. By [CZ, Lemma 3.2.2 and Definition 3.1.1], it follows that there is a correspondence between isoclasses of simple modules for C and H. Theorem 3.2.1 thus follows from equation (3.2). Theorem 3.2.3 then follows immediately from [CZ, Corollary 5.2.2] and Proposition 2.5.3.

3.3.6. In the following we will freely interpret H-modules as B-modules with trivial B_+-action. By [CZ, Proposition 5.2.3], for any $\mu \in \mathbf{L}_C$, the cell module is given by

$$W(\mu) := C \otimes_B W^0(\mu). \tag{3.3}$$

For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_C$, we also define

$$\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) := C \otimes_B L^0(\lambda) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{\Delta} := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \overline{\Delta}(\lambda). \tag{3.4}$$

The simple C-module $L(\lambda)$ is the simple top of the module $\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)$, see [CZ, Lemma 3.1.4].

3.3.7. By Maschke's theorem, the algebra H in (3.2) is semisimple if $p \notin [2, n]$. The quasi-heredity in Theorem 3.2.2 thus follows from [CZ, Corollary 4.5.4(3)]. The standard module are given by

$$\Delta(\lambda) \;:=\; \overline{\Delta}(\lambda) \;\cong\; W(\lambda) \qquad \text{if } p \notin [2, n], \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \Lambda_C = \mathbf{L}_C.$$

All of this also follows immediately from 2.3.2, by Theorems 3.2.1 and 3.2.3(1).

3.4. **BGG reciprocity.** In this section we assume that $p = \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$.

3.4.1. The algebra C inherits an anti-automorphism ϕ from the anti-autoequivalence φ of $\mathcal{A}$ in 2.1.6. It is clear that $\phi(H) = H$, $\phi(B_+) = \overline{B}_-$ and $\phi(\overline{B}_-) = B_+$. Moreover, the restriction of ϕ to H corresponds to the anti-automorphisms ψ of the $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_i$ in 2.5.4. We consider the corresponding contravariant equivalence Υ_ϕ of C-mod of equation (2.1).

For any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we define $\lambda^\phi \in \Lambda$ by the requirement $L(\lambda) \cong \Upsilon_\phi(L(\lambda^\phi))$. Then we have $\Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\lambda^\phi)) \cong \nabla(\lambda)$ and hence, by equation (2.3)

$$(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) \;=\; [\Delta(\mu^\phi) : L(\lambda^\phi)].$$

It thus remains to show that $\lambda^\phi = \lambda'$ in order to prove the BGG reciprocity relation in Theorem 3.2.2. This relation follows from equation (2.2) and the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4.2. *For any $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_C\left(\Delta(\lambda), \Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\mu))\right) \;=\; \delta_{\lambda,\mu'}\Bbbk.$$

Proof. By equations (2.1) and (3.4) we have

$$\Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\mu)) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Hom}_B(L^0(\mu), \mathrm{Hom}_\Bbbk(C, \Bbbk)) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Hom}_H(L^0(\mu), \mathrm{Hom}_\Bbbk(C/CB_+, \Bbbk)).$$

The action of $x \in C$ on $\alpha : L^0(\mu) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\Bbbk(C/CB_+, \Bbbk)$ is given by

$$((x\alpha)(v))(\overline{a}) = (\alpha(v))(\phi(x)\overline{a}), \qquad \text{for all } \; v \in L^0(\mu) \text{ and } a \in C \text{ with } \overline{a} = a + CB_+.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_C\left(\Delta(\lambda), \Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\mu))\right) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Hom}_H(L^0(\lambda), \Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\mu))^{B_+}). \tag{3.5}$$

Using $\phi(B_+) = \overline{B}_-$, it follows that

$$\Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\mu))^{B_+} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_H\left(L^0(\mu), \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk}(\overline{B}_-C\backslash C/CB_+, \Bbbk)\right).$$

As $\overline{B}_-C$ is the subspace of C spanned by all diagrams containing cups and CB_+ the subspace spanned by all diagrams containing caps, the right H-module $\overline{B}_-C\backslash C/CB_+$ is clearly isomorphic to the right regular H-module. This implies

$$\Upsilon_\phi(\Delta(\mu))^{B_+} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_H\left(L^0(\mu), \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk}(H, \Bbbk)\right) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk}(L^0(\mu), \Bbbk) \cong \Upsilon_\psi(L^0(\mu)),$$

as H-modules. The conclusion hence follows from equations (3.5) and (2.5). □

4. The periplectic Brauer algebras A_n

In this section we will transfer results from C_n to A_n through the exact 'Schur functor'

$$F = e_n^* - = e_n^* C \otimes_C - : \ C_n\text{-mod} \ \to \ A_n\text{-mod}. \tag{4.1}$$

4.1. Main theorems on A_n.

We fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and set $p := \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)$.

Theorem 4.1.1.

(1) If n is odd, A_n is Morita equivalent to C_n.
(2) If n is even and $n \notin \{2,4\}$, the functor F induces equivalences

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_C(M,N) \ \to \ \mathrm{Ext}^i_A(FM,FN), \qquad \text{for all } \ M,N \in \mathcal{F}(\overline{\Delta}) \quad \text{and} \quad i \in \{0,1\}.$$

If $n \notin \{2,4\}$ and $p \notin [2,n]$, C_n is thus a quasi-hereditary 1-cover of A_n, in the sense of [Ro, Definition 4.37]*, and a Schur algebra, see e.g.* [CZ, Definition 2.9.4].

Theorem 4.1.2.

(1) The isoclasses of simple A_n-modules are labelled by $\Lambda_{A_n} := \bigsqcup_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} \mathcal{P}^p_{n-2j} = \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}^0(n)} \mathcal{P}^p_i$.
(2) The algebra A_n is standardly based, for $(\mathbf{L}_A, \trianglelefteq) = (\mathbf{L}_C, \trianglelefteq)$ as introduced in Theorem 3.2.3.
(3) The cell modules of A_n form a standard system for $(\mathbf{L}, \trianglelefteq)$ if and only if $n \notin \{2,4\}$ and $p \notin \{2,3\}$. In this case, multiplicities in cell filtrations are unambiguous.
(4) If $n \notin \{2,4\}$ and $p \notin [2,n]$, we have

$$(P(\lambda) : W(\mu)) \ = \ [W(\mu') : L(\lambda')], \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in \Lambda_A \ \text{ and } \ \mu \in \mathbf{L}_A = \Lambda_C.$$

Remark 4.1.3. The twist by $\lambda \mapsto \lambda'$ in the BGG reciprocity relation represents the obstruction for the standardly based structure of A to be a cellular datum.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proofs of the two theorems.

4.2. Some morphisms in $\mathcal{A}$.

4.2.1. For any $i \in \mathcal{J}(n)$ we set

$a_i :=$  $\in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(i,n) = e_n^* C e_i^*$.

For $i \in \mathcal{J}(n)$ different from 0, so $i \in \mathcal{J}^0(n)$, we set

$b_i :=$  $\in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(n,i) = e_i^* C e_n^*$.

Finally, in case n is even, we set

$b_0 :=$  $\in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(n,0) = e_0^* C e_n^*$.

A direct computation then proves the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2.2. *If $i \neq 0$, we have $b_i a_i = e_i^*$.*

Corollary 4.2.3. *For $M \in C$-mod and $j \in \mathcal{J}(n)$ non-zero, the vector space homomorphism*

$$e_j^* M \ \to \ \mathrm{Hom}_A(e_n^* C e_j^*, e_n^* M), \qquad v \mapsto \alpha_v \quad \textit{with} \ \ \alpha_v(x) = xv, \tag{4.2}$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. By Lemma 4.2.2, an inverse is given by mapping $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(e_n^* C e_j^*, e_n^* M)$ to $b_j \alpha(a_j)$. □

4.2.4. By construction, for any simple C-module L_C, the $e_n^* C e_n^*$-module $e_n^* L_C$ is either simple or zero. By definition of $L_C(\lambda)$ in 3.3.6, we have have $e_j^* L_C(\lambda) \neq 0$ with $j = |\lambda|$, for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_C$. Corollary 4.2.3 thus implies that $e_n^* L_C(\lambda) \neq 0$ if $\lambda \neq \varnothing$. On the other hand, $L_C(\varnothing)$ is the one-dimensional C-module which satisfies $e_0^* L_C(\varnothing) = L_C(\varnothing)$, so $e_n^* L_C(\lambda) = 0$. It is a straightforward standard property that there are no non-zero morphisms between $e_n^* L_C(\lambda)$ and $e_n^* L_C(\mu)$, if $\lambda \neq \mu$. This implies Theorem 4.1.2(1) and we define the labelling of simple A_n-modules by

$$F L_{C_n}(\lambda) \ = \ \begin{cases} L_{A_n}(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \neq \varnothing \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda = \varnothing, \end{cases} \qquad \text{for any } \lambda \in \Lambda_C. \tag{4.3}$$

We will simplify the notation of $L_{A_n}(\lambda)$ to $L_A(\lambda)$, $L_n(\lambda)$ or $L(\lambda)$ depending on which information is not clear from context.

4.3. **A pair of adjoint functors.** We consider the left exact functor

$$G = \mathrm{Hom}_{A_n}(e_n^* C_n, -) : \ A_n\text{-mod} \to C_n\text{-mod}, \tag{4.4}$$

which is right adjoint to the exact functor F in equation (4.1). We have the two corresponding adjoint natural transformations, the unit $\eta : \mathrm{Id} \to G \circ F$ and the counit $\varepsilon : F \circ G \to \mathrm{Id}$. The counit ε is clearly an isomorphism.

Lemma 4.3.1.

(1) If n is odd, F and G are mutually inverse equivalences between C_n-mod and A_n-mod.

(2) If n is even, $\eta_M : M \to G \circ F(M)$ for $M \in C_n$-mod is an isomorphism if and only if

$$e_0^* M \ \to \ \mathrm{Hom}_{A_n}(e_n^* C_n e_0^*, e_n^* M), \qquad v \mapsto \alpha_v, \qquad \textit{with} \ \ \alpha_v(x) = xv,$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. For any M in C-mod, we have that $G \circ F(M)$ is given by $\mathrm{Hom}_A(e_n^* C, e_n^* M)$. The morphism η_M decomposes into vector space morphisms from $e_j^* M$ to $e_j^* G \circ F(M)$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}(n)$. These morphisms are precisely the ones in equation (4.2).

If n is odd, we have $0 \notin \mathcal{J}(n)$ and Corollary 4.2.3 thus implies that η_M is an isomorphism for any module M, hence the natural transformation $\eta : \mathrm{Id} \to G \circ F$ is an isomorphism and part (1) follows. Similarly, for n even, Corollary 4.2.3 implies that η_M is an isomorphism if and only if $e_0^* M \to e_0^* G \circ F(M)$ is an isomorphism, proving part (2). □

Lemma 4.3.1 implies that A_n and C_n are Morita equivalent when n is odd, proving Theorem 4.1.1(1) and everything in Theorem 4.1.2 for the case n odd, by Theorems 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.

4.3.2. The subalgebra of A_n spanned by diagrams without cups is isomorphic to $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$. The algebra $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$ is also naturally a quotient of A_n, with respect to the two-sided ideal I spanned by all diagrams which contain at least one cup (or cap). We write $A_n = \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n \oplus I$.

Corollary 4.3.3. *The module $L_A(\lambda)$, for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n^p \subset \Lambda_A$, is equal to $L^0(\lambda)$ as a $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$-module and has trivial action of I.*

Proof. By equations (4.3) and (3.4), we have

$$L_A(\lambda) \cong e_n^* L_C(\lambda) \cong e_n^* \overline{\Delta}(\lambda).$$

The result thus follows from the fact that $I \subset CB_+$, where A is interpreted inside C. □

4.4. **Some idempotents and a nilpotent.** From now on we will restrict to *the case n even.* We introduce elements $c_i^* \in A_n$, for $i \in \mathcal{J}(n)$, defined as $c_i^* := a_i b_i$. These are given explicitly by

$c_0^* =$ $c_i^* =$

We also write $c_{-2}^* = 0$. We have

$$c_j^* c_i^* = c_i^*, \qquad \text{if } j \geq i \text{ and } (j,i) \neq (0,0).$$

So, for $i > 0$, c_i^* is an idempotent, and we have $(c_0^*)^2 = 0$.

Lemma 4.4.1. *For each $i \in \mathcal{J}(n)$, we have isomorphisms of left A-modules*

$$e_n^* C e_i^* \;\cong Ac_i^* \qquad \textit{and} \qquad e_n^* C e_{i-2}^* C e_i^* \;\cong Ac_{i-2}^* Ac_i^*.$$

Proof. Using b_i from 4.2.1, we find an injective morphism

$$e_n^* C e_i^* \hookrightarrow Ac_i^*, \quad y \mapsto y b_i. \tag{4.5}$$

From considering the bases of diagrams of both spaces, it follows that this is an isomorphism.

Inside $e_n^* C e_i^*$, the submodule $e_n^* C e_{i-2}^* C e_i^*$ is spanned by all diagrams with at least $(n-i+2)/2$ cups. The number of cups of a diagram is preserved under the isomorphism (4.5). This proves the second isomorphism. □

Corollary 4.4.2. *For each $i \in \mathcal{J}(n)$, we have an isomorphism of A-modules*

$$e_n^* C \otimes_B H e_i^* \;\cong Ac_i^* / Ac_{i-2}^* Ac_i^*.$$

Proof. As a special case of [CZ, Lemma 3.2.8], we have

$$C \otimes_B H e_i^* \;\cong\; C e_i^* / C e_{i-2}^* C e_i^*.$$

The result hence follows from Lemma 4.4.1. □

In particular, by equation (3.4), this corollary, or Lemma 4.4.1, implies an isomorphism

$$e_n^* \overline{\Delta}(\varnothing) \;\tilde{\to}\; Ac_0^*, \qquad y \mapsto y b_0. \tag{4.6}$$

Theorem 4.4.3 (Double centralisers)**.** *If $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>2}$, the (A,C)-bimodule $X := e_n^* C$ satisfies*

$$A \cong \mathrm{End}_C(X) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad C \cong \mathrm{End}_A(X)^{\mathrm{op}}.$$

Proof. The first isomorphism is by definition of $A = e_n^* C e_n^*$. Lemma 4.4.1 implies that ${}_A X \cong \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} Ac_i^*$. We have an injective vector space morphism

$$e_i^* C e_j^* \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_i^*, Ac_j^*), \qquad x \mapsto \alpha_x \text{ with } \alpha_x(c_i^*) = a_i x b_j. \tag{4.7}$$

Assume first that $i \neq 0$. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_i^*, Ac_j^*)$, we consider $b_i \alpha(c_i^*) \in e_i^* C c_j^*$. Diagrammatically removing b_j from the right yields an element of $e_i^* C e_j^*$. This procedure creates an inverse to (4.7).

Now assume $i = 0$. For any $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, Ac_j^*)$, we can use the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.5.2, for analogues of w with the cup in all positions of the cups of c_0^* to show that $\alpha(c_0^*) \in c_0^* A c_j^*$. One then constructs the inverse as in the above paragraph. □

4.5. **Faithfulness of the covers.** We define $x \in A_n$ as

$x :=$ $+$

One checks easily that the kernel of the epimorphism $Ac_2^* \twoheadrightarrow Ac_0^*$, given by $a \mapsto ac_0^*$ for any $a \in Ac_2^*$, is generated by $x \in Ac_2^*$. This implies the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5.1. *We have a short exact sequence*

$$0 \to Ax \to Ac_2^* \to Ac_0^* \to 0.$$

Lemma 4.5.2. *If $n \geq 4$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, A/Ac_0^*A) = 0.$$

Proof. Consider an $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, A/Ac_0^*A)$. Let $a \in A$ be such that $\alpha(c_0^*) = a + Ac_0^*A$. Consider also the diagram

$w :=$

Since $wc_0^* = -c_0^*$ we must have $wa = -a$, so a is a linear combination of diagrams which have the same cup as w. Since $c_2^*c_0^* = c_0^*$, we also have $c_2^*a = a$, so every diagram in a must have $n/2$ cups and hence $a \in Ac_0^*A$. □

Lemma 4.5.3. *For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_C$, with $|\lambda| = i$, we have a monomorphism of A-modules*

$$e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow Ac_i^*/Ac_{i-2}^*Ac_i^*.$$

The cokernel has a filtration with sections of the form $e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\mu)$ with $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_i^p$.

Proof. Since $He_i^* \cong \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_i$ is a group algebra and therefore self-injective, we have an inclusion $L^0(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_i$ for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_i^p$. Equation (3.4) and Lemma 3.3.3(4) thus imply that we have an inclusion

$$\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow C \otimes_B He_i^*,$$

where the cokernel has a filtration with sections of the form $\overline{\Delta}(\mu)$ with $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_i^p$. The conclusion then follows from the exactness of the functor e_n^*- and Corollary 4.4.2. □

Proposition 4.5.4. *Assume $n \geq 4$, then η yields an isomorphism between $\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)$ and $GF(\overline{\Delta}(\lambda))$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_C$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.3.1(2) and the isomorphism in equation (4.5), it suffices to prove that

$$e_0^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) \;\to\; \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)), \qquad v \mapsto \alpha_v, \qquad \text{with } \alpha_v(c_0^*) = a_0 v$$

is an isomorphism. For $\lambda = \varnothing$, we have $\overline{\Delta}(\varnothing) \cong Ce_0^*$. By equation (4.6), the above morphism for this case can be rewritten as

$$e_0^*Ce_0^* \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, Ac_0^*), \quad v \mapsto \beta_v \quad \text{with} \quad \beta_v(c_0^*) = a_0 v b_0.$$

This is precisely the isomorphism in equation (4.7).

For $\lambda \vdash i$ with $i > 0$, we have $e_0^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) = 0$, so it suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)) = 0, \qquad \forall i > 0. \tag{4.8}$$

By Lemmata 4.5.1 and 4.5.3 we have monomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_2^*, e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_2^*, Ac_i^*/Ac_{i-2}^*Ac_i^*).$$

As c_2^* is an idempotent included in Ac_{i-2}^*A when $i > 2$, this implies equation (4.8) for $i > 2$.

Finally, we focus on $i = 2$. By Lemma 4.5.3 we have an inclusion

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(2, \lambda)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, Ac_2^*/Ac_0^*Ac_2^*).$$

The right term is zero by Lemma 4.5.2. So (4.8) holds true, which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 4.5.5. *If $n > 4$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(Ax, Ac_0^*) = 0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ax, Ac_{2j}^*/Ac_{2j-2}^*Ac_{2j}^*) \quad \textit{for } j \geq 2.$$

Proof. We introduce diagrams $y_1, y_2 \in A$ as

$y_1 :=$  $y_2 :=$ 

We have $(y_1 + y_2)x = -x$ and $c_4^* x = x$. If $a \in Ac_0^*$ is the image of x under a morphism $Ax \to Ac_0^*$, then we must have $(y_1 + y_2)a = -a$ and $c_4^* a = a$. This implies that a is the sum of diagrams which contain all the $n/2 - 2$ cups of c_4^* and either a cup connecting dots 1 and 2 (as in y_2), or a cup connecting dots 3 and 4 (as in y_1). As all diagrams in Ac_0^* contain n cups it follows that a is proportional to c_0^*. However, we have $y_2 c_0^* = c_0^* = -y_1 c_0^*$. This implies that $a = 0$, proving the left equation.

Now we consider $a \in Ac_{2j}^*$ such that $a + Ac_{2j-2}^* Ac_{2j}^*$ is the image of x under a morphism from Ax. Again we can assume $(y_1 + y_2)a = -a$ and $c_4^* a = a$, which implies that a is a linear combination of diagrams with at least $n/2 - 1$ cups. Since $j \geq 2$, this implies that $a \in Ac_{2j-2}^* A$. □

Lemma 4.5.6. *If $n > 4$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Ext}_A^1(Ac_0^*, Ac_{2j}^*/Ac_{2j-2}^*Ac_{2j}^*) \quad \textit{for } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. The short exact sequence in Lemma 4.5.1, implies an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_2^*, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(Ax, M) \to \mathrm{Ext}_A^1(Ac_0^*, M) \to 0, \tag{4.9}$$

for an arbitrary A-module M. Lemma 4.5.5 hence implies the vanishing of extensions with $M = Ac_{2j}^*/Ac_{2j-2}^*Ac_{2j}^*$ for all $j \neq 1$. We thus focus on $M := Ac_2^*/Ac_0^*Ac_2^*$.

For this M, the left space in (4.9) is zero by Lemma 4.5.2, the second space from the left is isomorphic to $c_2^*(A/Ac_0^*A)c_2^* \cong \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_2$, which has dimension 2. Using the same reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 4.5.5, the dimension of the third space is bounded by the dimension of the space of elements v in $Ac_2^*/Ac_0^*Ac_2^*$ which satisfy $c_4^* v = v$ and $(y_1 + y_2)v = -v$, which is also 2. This shows that the extension vanishes, which concludes the proof. □

Proposition 4.5.7. *For $n > 4$, we have $\mathcal{R}_1 G \circ F(\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_C$.*

Proof. Equation (4.4) and Lemma 4.4.1 imply that for any C-module N we have

$$\mathcal{R}_1 G \circ F(N) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathrm{Ext}_A^1(Ac_0^*, e_n^* N) = 0.$$

We consider $N = \overline{\Delta}(\lambda)$. For $\lambda = \varnothing$, the extension vanishes by equation (4.6) and Lemma 4.5.6. Consider $\lambda \vdash i$ with $i > 0$, Lemma 4.5.3 yields an exact sequence

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(Ac_0^*, K) \to \mathrm{Ext}_A^1(Ac_0^*, e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)) \to \mathrm{Ext}_A^1(Ac_0^*, Ac_i^*/Ac_{i-2}^*Ac_i^*),$$

where K has a filtration with sections of the form $e_n^*\overline{\Delta}(\mu)$ with $\mu \vdash i$. The left-hand space is zero by equation (4.8), the right-hand space is zero by Lemma 4.5.6. Hence the middle space is zero, which concludes the proof. □

The conclusion in Theorem 4.1.1(2) then follows from Propositions 4.5.4 and 4.5.7, precisely as in the proof of [CZ, Theorem 9.2.2].

4.6. **Projective and cell modules.** By [YL, Proposition 3.5] and Theorem 3.2.3(1), A is standardly based for poset $(\mathbf{L}, \trianglelefteq)$, with cell modules

$$W_A(\lambda) \;=\; F(W_C(\lambda)) \;=\; e_n^* C \otimes_B W_i^0(\lambda), \tag{4.10}$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_C$. As none of these modules is zero we have $\mathbf{L}_A = \mathbf{L}_C$. This proves Theorem 4.1.2(2).

4.6.1. The cell modules of C are included in $\mathcal{F}(\overline{\Delta})$, by definitions in 3.3.6 and Lemma 3.3.3(4). If $n > 4$, Theorem 4.1.1(2) thus implies that the cell modules of A_n form a standard system if and only if the cell modules of C_n form a standard system. Theorem 3.2.3(2) thus implies that for $n > 4$, the cell modules form a standard system if and only if $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2, 3\}$. For $n \in \{2, 4\}$, Corollaries 9.1.4(1) and 9.3.3(2) imply that the cell modules do not form a standard system. The fact that multiplicities in filtrations with sections given by modules forming a standard system are well-defined follows immediately from [DR]. This concludes the proof of 4.1.2(3).

Lemma 4.6.2. *For all $\lambda \in \Lambda_A$, we have*

$$P_A(\lambda) \;\cong\; e_n^* P_C(\lambda).$$

Proof. As $|\lambda| \neq 0$, we find that $e_n^* P_C(\lambda)$ is projective by Lemma 4.4.1. Furthermore, by equation (4.3), for any $\mu \in \Lambda_A$, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(FP_C(\lambda), L_A(\mu)) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Hom}_C(P_C(\lambda), GL_A(\mu)).$$

As $FG \cong \mathrm{Id}$ and hence $FGL_A(\mu) \cong L_A(\mu)$. We find that $GL_A(\mu)$ is a module with $[GL_A(\mu) : L_C(\mu)] = 1$ and $[GL_A(\mu) : L_C(\lambda)] = 0$ for any other $\lambda \in \Lambda_A$. This concludes the proof. □

Corollary 4.6.3. *Assume $n > 4$ and $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2, 3\}$. For all $\lambda \in \Lambda_A$ and $\mu \in \mathbf{L}_A$, we have*

$$(P_A(\lambda) : W_A(\mu)) = (P_C(\lambda) : W_A(\mu)).$$

Proof. Under these conditions, the filtration multiplicities are independent of the chosen filtration, by Theorems 4.1.2(3) and 3.2.3(2). The statement thus follows immediately from the exactness of F, equation (4.10) and Lemma 4.6.2. □

As F is exact, equations (4.10) and (4.3) imply that

$$[W_A(\mu) : L_A(\lambda)] = [W_C(\mu) : L_C(\lambda)], \qquad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda_A \text{ and } \mu \in \mathbf{L}_A. \tag{4.11}$$

Theorem 4.1.2(4) then follows from the BGG reciprocity relation in Theorem 3.2.2 and Corollary 4.6.3.

Remark 4.6.4. From the proof of Corollary 4.6.3, it is clear that the condition $n \notin \{2, 4\}$ in Theorem 4.1.2(4) is only required in order to have unambiguous multiplicities $(P(\lambda) : W(\mu))$. It remains true for $n \in \{2, 4\}$ that there exists a filtration of $P(\lambda)$ for which the equation holds true.

Lemma 4.6.5. *Consider $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_i^p$ with $i \in \mathcal{J}^0(n)$. The idempotent $a_i e_\lambda^{(i)} b_i \in A_n$, with $e_\lambda^{(i)}$ a primitive idempotent in A_i corresponding to $L_{A_i}(\lambda)$ and a_i, b_i as defined in 4.2.1, is primitive and corresponds to $L_{A_n}(\lambda)$.*

Proof. It is obvious that $e_\lambda^{(i)} \in e_i^* C_n e_i^*$ remains primitive as an idempotent in C_n. By construction, the isomorphism $e_n^* C_n e_i^* \cong A_n c_i^*$ of Lemma 4.4.1 restricts to

$$e_n^* C e_\lambda^{(i)} \cong A_n a_i e_\lambda^{(i)} b_i.$$

This module is isomorphic to $P_{A_n}(\lambda)$, by Lemma 4.6.2, which concludes the proof. □

5. The Bratteli diagram and Murphy bases

We construct the Bratteli diagram related to the sequence of standardly based algebras given by the inclusion of the periplectic Brauer algebras in 2.1.7. The analogue for the Brauer algebras can be found in [LR, §6] or [CDM, Proposition 2.7]. This will allow us to construct a Murphy basis for each cell module of A_n, similarly to the case of the Brauer algebra in [En, §9] or the Iwahori-Hecke algebra in [Ma1, §3.2]. We could use this construction to prove the standardly based structure of A_n more directly than in Section 4, but we do not pursue this.

5.1. **Bratteli diagrams.** First we introduce our Bratteli diagram, and some general terminology.

5.1.1. Consider a chain

$$R_1 \subset R_2 \subset \cdots \subset R_i \subset R_{i+1} \subset \cdots$$

of standardly based algebras, with $R_1 = \Bbbk$. Assume that the restriction of an arbitrary cell module of R_{i+1} to R_i admits a filtration with sections given by R_i-cell modules, such that no cell module of R_i appears more than once for a fixed cell module of R_{i+1}. Corresponding to that chain of algebras (and that choice of filtrations) we can then define a multiplicity free Bratteli diagram as follows. On the ith row we place the elements of $\mathbf{L}_{R_i}$, these are the vertices of the diagram. Then we draw an edge between an element of $\mathbf{L}_{R_i}$ and one of $\mathbf{L}_{R_{i+1}}$ if the corresponding cell module of R_i appears in the filtration of the restriction of the cell module of R_{i+1}.

5.1.2. The set of vertices on row i in the Bratteli diagram which appears in the study of BMW and Brauer algebras in [En, LR] is $\mathbf{L}_{A_i} = \mathbf{L}_{C_i}$. The edges in the Bratteli diagram are then given by connecting any partition λ on the ith row with all partitions on the $i+1$-th row which are in $\mathcal{R}(\lambda) \sqcup \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$, see 2.4.4. The top part of this diagram diagram, see [LR, Figure 2], is given by

(5.1)



5.1.3. A *path* in the Bratteli diagram is a sequence of vertices $\mathfrak{t} = (\mathfrak{t}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{t}^{(2)}, \cdots, \mathfrak{t}^{(k)})$ such that $\mathfrak{t}^{(l)}$ is on the lth row and there is an edge between $\mathfrak{t}^{(l)}$ and $\mathfrak{t}^{(l+1)}$. Denote the set of all paths in the Bratteli diagram (5.1) ending in a partition λ on the ith row by $\mathrm{St}_i(\lambda)$. Note that in case $\lambda \vdash i$, the set $\mathrm{St}_i(\lambda)$ can naturally be identified with the set $\mathrm{St}(\lambda)$ of standard tableaux of shape λ, see [LR, §4], justifying the notation. For any $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_i(\lambda)$, we let $\mathfrak{t}' \in \mathrm{St}_{i-1}(\mathfrak{t}^{(i-1)})$ be defined by $\mathfrak{t} = (\mathfrak{t}', \lambda)$.

5.1.4. Each row in the Bratteli diagram (5.1) is equipped with the partial order $\trianglelefteq$ in equation (2.4). We have drawn the Bratteli diagram in such a way that if $\lambda \rhd \mu$, then λ appears to the left of μ.

For a fixed partition λ on the nth row we introduce a lexicographic partial order $\trianglelefteq$ on the paths $\mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$, by setting $\mathfrak{t} \lhd \mathfrak{s}$ if and only if there is a k, with $1 \leq k \leq n$, such that

$$\mathfrak{t}^{(k)} \lhd \mathfrak{s}^{(k)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathfrak{t}^{(j)} = \mathfrak{s}^{(j)}, \text{ for all } k < j \leq n.$$

The partial order can equivalently be defined by iteration, for $\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{s} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$, we have

$$\mathfrak{t} \lhd \mathfrak{s} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)} \lhd \mathfrak{s}^{(n-1)}, & \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)} = \mathfrak{s}^{(n-1)} \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}' \lhd \mathfrak{s}'. \end{cases}$$

When $|\lambda| = n$, the order $\trianglelefteq$ on $\mathrm{St}_n(\lambda) = \mathrm{St}(\lambda)$ does not reduce to the partial order on standard λ-tableaux in [Ma1, §3.1], but to an extension of that order.

5.2. **Restriction of cell modules.** We make no assumption on $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)$. We will use the shorthand notation $W_n(\lambda) := W_{A_n}(\lambda)$, with $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_A$, for the cell modules of A_n.

Theorem 5.2.1. *The restriction of $W_n(\lambda)$ of A_n has a filtration with sections given by cell modules of A_{n-1} such that the multiplicities correspond to the Bratteli diagram* (5.1).

5.2.2. By equation (4.10) and Corollary 3.3.4, we have

$$W_n(\lambda) \;=\; e_n^* N^{\text{-}} e_i^* \otimes W^0(\lambda),$$

as vector spaces. To describe the restriction to A_{n-1}, we will decompose $e_n^* N^{\text{-}} e_i^*$. We write

$$e_n^* N^{\text{-}} e_i^* \;=\; N_{n-1,i-1} \;\oplus N_{n-1,i+1},$$

where $N_{n-1,i-1}$, resp. $N_{n-1,i+1}$, is spanned by all diagrams having a propagating line, resp. cup, ending in the right-most dot on the upper line. We have a natural isomorphism of vector spaces

$$e_{n-1}^* N^{\text{-}} e_{i-1}^* \;\tilde{\to}\; N_{n-1,i-1}, \quad \alpha \mapsto \alpha \otimes I. \tag{5.2}$$

Define $a \in e_{i+2}^* N^{\text{-}} e_i^*$ as

$$a := \left| \;\; \right| \cdots \left| \;\; \cup \right.$$

Any diagram $d \in N_{n-1,i+1}$ can be uniquely decomposed as

$$d = (d^{(1)} \otimes I) \circ (d^{(2)} \otimes I) \circ a, \quad \text{with} \quad d^{(1)} \in e_{n-1}^* N^{-} e_{i+1}^* \;\text{ and }\; d^{(2)} \in \mathbb{S}_{i+1} = e_{i+1}^* H e_{i+1}^*. \tag{5.3}$$

By construction, $d^{(2)}$ is a shortest representative of the coset $\mathbb{S}_{i+1}/(\mathbb{S}_i \times \mathbb{S}_1)$. Note that $d^{(1)}$ is either a diagram, or a diagram multiplied with -1.

For the following lemma we assume the convention $e_{n-1}^* C \otimes_B (\mathrm{Ind}^{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{n+1}} W^0(\lambda)) = 0$ for $\lambda \vdash n$.

Lemma 5.2.3. *The restriction to A_{n-1} of $W_n(\lambda)$ satisfies a short exact sequence*

$$0 \;\to\; e_{n-1}^* C \otimes_B (\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i-1}} W^0(\lambda)) \;\to\; \mathrm{Res}_{A_{n-1}} W_n(\lambda) \;\to\; e_{n-1}^* C \otimes_B (\mathrm{Ind}^{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i+1}} W^0(\lambda)) \;\to\; 0.$$

Proof. The subspace $N_{n-1,i-1} \otimes W^0(\lambda)$ of $W_n(\lambda)$ constitutes an A_{n-1}-submodule. Using the isomorphism in (5.2), this submodule is easily identified with

$$e_{n-1}^* C \otimes_B \mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i-1}} W^0(\lambda) \;=\; e_{n-1}^* N^{\text{-}} e_{i-1}^* \otimes W^0(\lambda).$$

Now we consider the vector space isomorphism

$$N_{n-1,i+1} \otimes W^0(\lambda) \;\to\; e_{n-1}^* N^{\text{-}} e_{i+1}^* \otimes \mathrm{Ind}^{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i+1}} W_0^\lambda, \quad d \otimes v \mapsto d^{(1)} \otimes d^{(2)} v,$$

where v is interpreted as $1 \otimes v \in \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i+1} \otimes_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_i} W^0(\lambda)$. This corresponds to the proposed isomorphism from the quotient of $W_n(\lambda)$ with respect to the submodule of the previous paragraph. □

As things simplify greatly, we will first briefly focus on the case $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$, before moving on to arbitrary characteristic.

Corollary 5.2.4. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$*, we have a short exact sequence*

$$0 \;\to\; \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)} W_{n-1}(\mu) \;\to\; \mathrm{Res}_{A_{n-1}} W_n(\lambda) \;\to\; \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)} W_{n-1}(\nu) \;\to\; 0.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 5.2.3 and the description of the restriction and induction in 2.5.5. □

5.2.5. If we fix n and we assume that $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$, we can define the Murphy basis of A_n easily, by iteration. For A_1 we take $v_{\mathfrak{t}}$ with $\mathfrak{t} = ((1))$ any non-zero vector and we assume that we have defined a basis $\{v_{\mathfrak{t}} \,|\, \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_{n-1}(\mu)\}$ of $W_{n-1}(\mu)$ for any $\mu \in \mathbf{L}_{A_{n-1}}$.

Now fix $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_{A_n}$. For any $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$ with $|\mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)}| < |\lambda|$, we define $v_{\mathfrak{t}} \in W_n(\lambda)$ to be the image of $v_{\mathfrak{t}'} \in W_{n-1}(\mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)})$ under the A_{n-1}-monomorphism in Corollary 5.2.4. Similarly, if $|\mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)}| > |\lambda|$, we define $v_{\mathfrak{t}} \in W_n(\lambda)$ to be the unique vector in $N_{n-1,i+1} \otimes W^0(\lambda)$, which is in the preimage of $v_{\mathfrak{t}'} \in W_{n-1}(\mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)})$ under the A_{n-1}-epimorphism in Corollary 5.2.4.

5.2.6. Now we return to arbitrary $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)$. We formulate the result in [Ja, Theorem 9.3] or [Ma1, Proposition 6.1] in a way which will be convenient later. For any $\lambda \vdash i$, we have

$$W^0(\lambda) \;=\; \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)} W^0(\lambda)^\mu,$$

vector spaces. We set

$$W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} := \bigoplus_{\kappa \rhd \mu} W^0(\lambda)^\kappa.$$

Then both $W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}}$ and $W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} \oplus W^0(\lambda)^\mu$ are $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i-1}$-submodules of $W^0(\lambda)$ and

$$(W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} \oplus W^0(\lambda)^\mu)/W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} \;\cong\; W^0(\mu).$$

Similarly, by [Ja, §17], we have a vector space decomposition

$$\mathrm{Ind}^{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i+1}} W^0(\lambda) \;=\; \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)} IW^0(\lambda)^\nu,$$

such that, with similar notation, we have a $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{i+1}$-module isomorphism

$$(IW^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\nu}} \oplus IW^0(\lambda)^\nu)/IW^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\nu}} \;\cong\; W^0(\nu).$$

Proof of Theorem 5.2.1. As the functor $C \otimes_B -$ is exact by Lemma 3.3.3(4), the statement follows immediately from Lemma 5.2.3 and the restriction and induction of Specht modules in 5.2.6. □

5.3. **The Murphy bases for A_n.** Fix an arbitrary $\Bbbk$. For each $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_{A_n}$, we will fix a basis

$$\{v_{\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)\} \qquad \text{of} \qquad W_n(\lambda),$$

for $W_n(\lambda)$ the cell module over A_n. This basis will be defined iteratively. For A_1 we take an arbitrary non-zero vector of the trivial module.

5.3.1. First we define a vector space decomposition

$$W_n(\lambda) \;=\; \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)} W_n(\mu)^\mu \;\oplus\; \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)} W_n(\lambda)^\nu.$$

For $\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)$, we set

$$W_n(\lambda)^\mu := N_{n-1,i-1} \otimes W^0(\lambda)^\mu.$$

For $\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$, we set

$$W_n(\lambda)^\nu := (e^*_{n-1} N^- e^*_{i-1} \otimes I) \otimes IW^0(\lambda)^\nu, \tag{5.4}$$

where $IW^0(\lambda)^\nu$ is realised inside the span of $(y \otimes I) \circ a \otimes u$, with y shortest representatives of $\mathbb{S}_{i+1}/\mathbb{S}_i$ in $\mathbb{S}_{i+1}$, $u \in W^0(\lambda)$ and a the fixed diagram from equation (5.3). For any $\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda) \sqcup \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ we set

$$W_n(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} = \bigoplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda) \sqcup \mathcal{A}(\lambda) \,|\, \kappa \rhd \mu} W_n(\lambda)^\kappa.$$

By Section 5.2, we have an isomorphism of A_{n-1}-modules

$$(W_n(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} \oplus W_n(\lambda)^\mu)/W_n(\lambda)^\mu \;\cong\; W_{n-1}(\mu). \tag{5.5}$$

5.3.2. For any $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$, the Murphy basis element $v_\mathfrak{t}$ is defined as the unique element of $W_n(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)}}$ such that its image under (5.5) is $v_{\mathfrak{t}'}$. Consequently, we have

$$W_n(\lambda)^\mu = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)\,|\,\mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)}=\mu} \Bbbk v_\mathfrak{t} \qquad \text{and} \qquad W_n(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}} = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s}\in\mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)\,|\,\mathfrak{s}^{(n-1)}\rhd\mu} \Bbbk v_\mathfrak{s}. \tag{5.6}$$

6. Jucys-Murphy elements and the centre of A_n

In this section we will construct a "family of JM elements" in the sense of [Ma2], which is compatible with the Murphy basis. For appropriate characteristic of the ground field, this family will even be 'complete' in the sense that it will separate between the different blocks of A_n.

6.1. **Definition.** We introduce natural analogues of the Jucys-Murphy elements of the symmetric group, see e.g. [Ma1, §3.3], or of the Brauer algebra, see [Na, §2] or [BSR].

6.1.1. We define the *Jucys-Murphy elements* $\{x_i \,|\, 1 \le i \le n\}$ in A_n as $x_1 := 0 \in A_n$, and

$$x_i := \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (j,i) + \overline{(j,i)}, \quad \text{for } 2 \le i \le n.$$

We will also use the notation $x_i^0 := \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}(j,i)$ for the corresponding Jucys-Murphy element of $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$.

As an example, we depict the non-trivial Jucys-Murphy elements of A_3:

$x_2 =$  $x_3 =$ 

Lemma 6.1.2. *For each $1 \le i \le n$, the element $x_i \in A_n$ commutes with every element in $A_{i-1} \subset A_n$. Consequently, the elements $\{x_i \,|\, 1 \le i \le n\}$ generate an abelian subalgebra of A_n.*

Proof. The statement is trivial for $i \in \{1,2\}$, so we assume $i > 2$. By construction, we have $wx_iw^{-1} = x_i$ for all $w \in \mathbb{S}_{i-1}$. As A_{i-1} is generated by $\mathbb{S}_{i-1}$ and ε_1, it suffices to prove that $\varepsilon_1 x_i = x_i\varepsilon_1$. Clearly ε_1 commutes with $\sum_{j=3}^{i-1}(j,i) + \overline{(j,i)}$, so we only need to prove that ε_1 commutes with

$$(1,i) + (2,i) + \overline{(1,i)} + \overline{(2,i)}.$$

This is essentially the claim that $\varepsilon_1 x_3 = x_3\varepsilon_1$. A quick calculation shows that we even have

$$\varepsilon_1 x_3 = 0 = x_3\varepsilon_1, \tag{6.1}$$

concluding the proof. □

6.1.3. Lemma 6.1.2 justifies the introduction of the term *Gelfand-Zetlin subalgebra* for the commutative subalgebra $\Gamma_n := \langle x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n\rangle$ of A_n generated by the Jucys-Murphy elements.

6.2. **Action of the Jucys-Murphy elements on the Murphy basis.**

6.2.1. Fix a field $\Bbbk$, an integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ and a partition $\lambda \vdash i$ for $i \in \mathcal{J}(n)$. To any $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$ as in 5.1.3, we associate a vector

$$c_\mathfrak{t} := (c_\mathfrak{t}(2), c_\mathfrak{t}(3), \dots, c_\mathfrak{t}(n)) \in \Bbbk^{n-1}, \qquad \text{with}$$

$$c_\mathfrak{t}(l) := \begin{cases} \mathrm{res}(b) & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}^{(l)} = \mathfrak{t}^{(l-1)} \cup b, \\ \mathrm{res}(b)+1 & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}^{(l-1)} = \mathfrak{t}^{(l)} \cup b, \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } 1 < l \le n. \tag{6.2}$$

Here we used the notion of residue of a box b in a Young diagram, as in 2.4.3.

Theorem 6.2.2. *Let $\Bbbk$ be an arbitrary field, and $W_n(\lambda)$ the cell module over A_n, with $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_A$. For the Murphy basis $\{v_\mathfrak{t} \,|\, \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)\}$ and the Jucys-Murphy elements $\{x_l \,|\, 1 < l \leq n\}$, we find*

$$x_l v_\mathfrak{t} - c_\mathfrak{t}(l) v_\mathfrak{t} \;\in \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s} \rhd \mathfrak{t}} \Bbbk v_\mathfrak{s}.$$

We start the proof with the following lemma, for which we use the notation of 5.2.2.

Lemma 6.2.3.

(1) For a diagram $d \in N_{n-1,i-1} \subset e_n^* N^{\text{-}} e_i^*$, we have $x_n d - d x_i^0 \in e_n^* C B_+ e_i^*$.
(2) For a diagram $d \in N_{n-1,i+1} \subset e_n^* N^{\text{-}} e_i^*$, we have

$$(x_n - 1)d - (d^{(1)} \otimes I) \circ (d^{(2)} \otimes I) \circ (x_{i+1}^0 \otimes I) \circ a \;\in\; N_{n-1,i-1}\mathbb{S}_i.$$

Proof. We start with part (1). If d has a cup ending in dots i and j, then $(j,n)d = -\overline{(i,n)}d$. Hence

$$x_n\, d \;=\; \left(\sum_{k \in D} (k,n) + \overline{(k,n)} \right) d,$$

where D is the subset of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ corresponding to dots on the upper line which have a propagating line. Clearly $\overline{(k,n)}d$ is a diagram with one cap, so $\overline{(k,n)}d \in e_n^* C B_+ e_i^*$. Part (1) then follows from

$$\sum_{k \in D} (k,n)\, d = \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} d\,(l,i).$$

Now consider a diagram d as in part (2) and set l_0 such that the l_0th dot from the left on the upper line is connected to the right-most dot by a cap. Take $1 \leq l < n$ arbitrary with $l \neq l_0$. We have $(l,n)d \in N_{n-1,i-1}\mathbb{S}_i$ unless l is the end point of a cap. On the other hand, if l is connected to j by a cap, we have $(l,n)d + \overline{(j,n)}d = 0$. Furthermore, we have $\overline{(l,n)}d = (l,l_0)d$ if l is not the end point of a cap. Finally, we have $(l_0,n)d = d$ and $\overline{(l_0,n)}d = 0$. Hence we obtain

$$x_n d - d - \sum_{j \in D} (j,l_0) d \;\in\; N_{n-1,i-1}\mathbb{S}_i,$$

where D corresponds again to all dots which are not on the cups. By definition, $(j,l_0)(d^{(1)} \otimes I) = (d^{(1)} \otimes I)(j', l_0')$, where k' for $k \in D \cup \{l_0\}$ denotes the position from the left of the dot corresponding to k on the upper line, when ignoring the dots not in $D \cup \{l_0\}$. Part (2) then follows immediately. □

We recall some basic facts concerning the Jucys-Murphy elements $\{x_j^0\}$ for the symmetric group.

Lemma 6.2.4. *Fix $\lambda \vdash i$.*

(1) For any $v \in W^0(\lambda)$, we have $\sum_{j=2}^i x_j^0 v \;=\; |\mathrm{res}(\lambda)| v$.
(2) For any $\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ and $v \in W^0(\lambda)^\mu$, we have

$$x_i^0 v - \mathrm{res}(b) v \;\in\; W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}}, \qquad \text{where } \lambda = \mu \cup b.$$

Proof. The element $\sum_{j=2}^i x_j^0 \in \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_i$ is central by [Ma1, Corollary 3.27] and thus acts as a constant on (the simple) Specht modules in characteristic zero. This remains true in arbitrary characteristic as this claim clearly does not depend on the field. The constant through which it acts then follows from [Ma1, Theorem 3.32]. Part (2) is a weaker version of a special case of [Ma1, Theorem 3.32]. □

We can now extend part (2) in the above lemma to periplectic Brauer algebras.

Lemma 6.2.5. *Consider $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_A$ and $\mu \in (\mathcal{R}(\lambda) \sqcup \mathcal{A}(\lambda)) \cap \mathbf{L}_A$. For any $v \in W(\lambda)^\mu$, we have*

$$x_n v - c v \in W(\lambda)^{\widehat{\mu}}, \quad \text{with}$$

(1) $c = \mathrm{res}(b)$, if $\lambda = \mu \cup b$;

(2) $c = 1 + \mathrm{res}(b)$*, if* $\mu = \lambda \cup b$*.*

Proof. Set $i := |\lambda|$. For μ as in part (1), the space $W_n(\lambda)^\mu$ is spanned by elements $d \otimes u$, with $u \in W^0(\lambda)^\mu$ and $d \in N_{n-1,i-1}$. By Lemma 6.2.3(1), we have

$$x_n(d \otimes u) \;=\; d \otimes x_i^0 u,$$

By Lemma 6.2.4(2), this is equal to $\mathrm{res}(b) d \otimes u$, up to elements $d \otimes u'$ with $u' \in W^0(\lambda)^{\hat{\mu}}$, proving part (1).

For part (2) we start by considering arbitrary elements in $\oplus_{\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)} W(\lambda)^\nu$. These are spanned by $d \otimes u$, with $d \in N_{n-1,i+1} \subset e_n^* N^- e_i^*$ and $u \in W^0(\lambda)$. By Lemma 6.2.3(2) we have

$$(x_n - 1)(d \otimes u) - (d^{(1)} \otimes I) \circ (d^{(2)} x_{i+1}^0 \otimes I) \circ a \otimes u \;\in \bigoplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)} W(\lambda)^\kappa.$$

By our definition (2.4) of the dominance order on partitions, the space in the right-hand side is contained in $W(\lambda)^{\widehat{\nu}}$ for any $\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$. Set $T^0 := \sum_{j=2}^{i+1} x_j^0$. Using Lemma 6.2.4(1) and the fact that T^0 is central in $\Bbbk \mathbb{S}_{i+1}$, we have

$$(d^{(2)} x_{i+1}^0 \otimes I) \circ a \otimes u \;=\; (T^0 \otimes I) \circ (d^{(2)} \otimes I) \circ a \otimes u - |\mathrm{res}(\lambda)| (d^{(2)} \otimes I) \circ a \otimes u.$$

Now $W(\lambda)^\nu$, with $\nu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ is realised as in (5.4), by the span of $v := (d^{(1)} \otimes I) \otimes z$ with $d^{(1)} \in e_{n-1}^* N^- e_{i-1}^*$ and $z \in I W^0(\lambda)^\nu$. By the previous paragraph we have

$$(x_n - 1 + |\mathrm{res}(\lambda)|)(d^{(1)} + I) \otimes z \;-\; (d^{(1)} + I) \otimes T_0 z \;\in\; W(\lambda)^{\widehat{\nu}}.$$

Now, by Lemma 6.2.4(1), we have $T_0 z - |\mathrm{res}(\nu)| z \in I W^0(\lambda)^{\widehat{\nu}}$. We thus find

$$\left(x_n - 1 + |\mathrm{res}(\lambda)| - |\mathrm{res}(\nu)|\right) (d^{(1)} + I) \otimes z \;\in\; W(\lambda)^{\widehat{\nu}},$$

which concludes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 6.2.2. For $n = 1$ the statement is trivial. Now we assume it is true for $n-1$. For $l < n$, the action of x_l on $W(\lambda)$ is determined by $\mathrm{Res}_{A_{n-1}} W(\lambda)$. For $v_\mathfrak{t}$ with $\mu := \mathfrak{t}^{(n-1)}$, its image in $(W_n(\lambda)^\mu \oplus W_n(\lambda)^{\hat{\mu}})/W_n(\lambda)^{\hat{\mu}}$ is given by $v_{\mathfrak{t}'}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$x_l v_{\mathfrak{t}'} - c_{\mathfrak{t}'}(l) v_{\mathfrak{t}'} \;\in \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{u} \in \mathrm{St}_{n-1}(\mu) \,|\, \mathfrak{u} \rhd \mathfrak{t}'} \Bbbk v_\mathfrak{u}.$$

As $c_{\mathfrak{t}'}(l) = c_\mathfrak{t}(l)$, this implies that

$$x_l v_\mathfrak{t} - c_\mathfrak{t}(l) v_\mathfrak{t} \;\in \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda) \,|\, \mathfrak{s}^{(n-1)} = \mu \,,\, \mathfrak{s}' \rhd \mathfrak{t}'} \Bbbk v_\mathfrak{s} \;\oplus\; W_n(\lambda)^{\hat{\mu}} \;\subset \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda) \,|\, \mathfrak{s} \rhd \mathfrak{t}} \Bbbk v_\mathfrak{s}.$$

The last inclusion follows from the definition of $\trianglelefteq$ on $\mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$ and equation (5.6).

The case $l = n$ follows from Lemma 6.2.5. □

Corollary 6.2.6. *For* $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_A$ *and* $\mu \in \Lambda_A$*, if* $[W_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] \neq 0$*, there exist* $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$ *and* $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathrm{St}_n(\mu)$ *with* $c_\mathfrak{t} = c_\mathfrak{s}$*.*

Proof. The proof follows [Ma1, §2]. Consider $W(\lambda)$ as a module over the Gelfand-Zetlin algebra Γ_n. All simple finite dimensional modules over Γ_n are one-dimensional. Since $L(\mu)$ is the top of $W(\mu)$, the property $[W(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$ implies in particular that there is a simple Γ_n-module which appears as a subquotient both in $W(\mu)$ and $W(\lambda)$. Theorem 6.2.2 thus completes the argument. □

Corollary 6.2.7. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$*. For* $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}_{A_n}$ *and* $\mu \vdash n$*, if*

$$[W_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] \neq 0,$$

then $\lambda \subset \mu$ *and the boxes in* $\mu \backslash \lambda$ *can be paired in a way that the contents of each pair differ by one.*

Proof. The condition $\lambda \subset \mu$ is immediate by the LR rule, since

$$\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n} W_n(\lambda) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n} e_n^* \Delta_{C_n}(\lambda) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathbb{S}_n}\left(L^0(\lambda)\otimes K\right),$$

with K the $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{n-i}$-module $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(0,n-i)$, for $i=|\lambda|$.

By definition (6.2), any $c_{\mathfrak{t}}$ for $\mathfrak{t}\in \mathrm{St}_n(\lambda)$ consists of the residues of λ (excluding that of the box in position (0,0)), together with pairs of elements in $\Bbbk$ which differ by one. Similarly $c_{\mathfrak{s}}$, for $\mathfrak{s}\in \mathrm{St}_n(\mu)=\mathrm{St}(\mu)$, consists only of the residues of μ. By Corollary 6.2.6, the residues in μ which do not appear in λ must thus pair up into pairs of elements which differ by one.

Furthermore, as the difference between the largest and smallest content of μ is strictly lower than n, the condition $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)\notin[2,n]$ implies that when two residues differ by one, the corresponding contents must also differ by one. This concludes the proof. □

6.3. **Some commutation relations.** In order to investigate which elements of the Gelfand-Zetlin subalgebra Γ_n belong to the centre of A_n, we calculate some relations with the generators.

Lemma 6.3.1. *For $1\leq k<n$, we have*

(1) $\varepsilon_k(x_k-x_{k+1})=\varepsilon_k=-(x_k-x_{k+1})\varepsilon_k$,
(2) $s_k x_k s_k = x_{k+1}-s_k-\varepsilon_k$,
(3) $s_k(x_k-x_{k+1})s_k=-2s_k-(x_k-x_{k+1})$,

Proof. We have $\varepsilon_k(i,k)=\varepsilon_k\overline{(i,k+1)}$ and $\varepsilon_k(i,k+1)=\varepsilon_k\overline{(i,k)}$ for all $i<k$. Furthermore, $\varepsilon_k s_k=-\varepsilon_k$ and $\varepsilon_k\varepsilon_k=0$, yielding the first equation in part (1), with the second following similarly.

For $i<k$, we find $s_k(i,k)s_k=(i,k+1)$ and $s_k\overline{(i,k)}s_k=\overline{(i,k+1)}$. Part (2) then follows immediately and part (3) is immediate consequence of part (2). □

Corollary 6.3.2. *For $1\leq k<n$, we have*

(1) $s_k(x_k-x_{k+1})^2=(x_k-x_{k+1})^2 s_k$,
(2) $\epsilon_k(x_k-x_{k+1})^2=\epsilon_k=(x_k-x_{k+1})^2\epsilon_k$,
(3) $s_k(x_k+x_{k+1})s_k=(x_k+x_{k+1})-2\varepsilon_k$,
(4) $s_k(x_kx_{k+1})=(x_kx_{k+1})s_k+x_k\varepsilon_k+\varepsilon_k x_k$.

Lemma 6.3.3. *For $1\leq k<n$ and $l\notin\{k,k+1\}$, we have $\varepsilon_k x_l=x_l\varepsilon_k$, and $s_k x_l=x_l s_k$.*

Proof. For $l>k+1$, we have $s_k,\varepsilon_k\in A_{l-1}\subset A_n$, so the equations follow from Lemma 6.1.2. For $l<k$, it follows immediately that x_l, being an element of A_l, commutes with s_k and ε_k, concluding the proof. □

Corollary 6.3.4. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk)\neq 2$ *and let f be an arbitrary element of Γ_n, we have*

$$\varepsilon_k\, f\, \varepsilon_k = 0, \qquad \text{for all } \; 1\leq k<n.$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.3.3, it suffices to prove that the claim is true for f an element in the subalgebra of A_n generated by x_k and x_{k+1}. Such an element is a linear combination of elements

$$f_{ab}:=(x_k-x_{k+1})^a(x_k+x_{k+1})^b \quad \text{ for } \; a,b\in\mathbb{N}.$$

From Lemma 6.3.1(1), we find $\varepsilon_k f_{ab}=\varepsilon_k f_{0b}$. To deal with f_{0b}, we proceed by induction on b. We thus assume $\varepsilon_k f_{0j}\varepsilon_k=0$ for $j<b$. Using Corollary 6.3.2(3), we calculate

$$\varepsilon_k(x_k+x_{k+1})^b\varepsilon_k \;=\; \varepsilon_k(x_k+x_{k+1})^b s_k\varepsilon_k \;=\; \varepsilon_k s_k(x_k+x_{k+1}-2\varepsilon_k)^b\varepsilon_k \;=\; -\varepsilon_k(x_k+x_{k+1}-2\varepsilon_k)^b\varepsilon_k.$$

The induction hypothesis can be used to show that the right-hand side is equal to $-\varepsilon_k(x_k+x_{k+1})^b\varepsilon_k$, which concludes the proof. □

The properties in Corollary 6.3.2 motivate the introduction of the following element,

$$\Theta := \prod_{2\leq i\neq j\leq n}((x_i-x_j)-1) = \prod_{2\leq i<j\leq n}\left(1-(x_i-x_j)^2\right) \;\in\; \Gamma_n \;\subset\; A_n, \tag{6.3}$$

assuming that $n>2$. For $n=2$, we just set $\Theta=0$.

6.4. **The centre.**

6.4.1. For the Hecke and Brauer algebras, many polynomials in the Jucys-Murphy elements are central see [Ma1, Corollary 3.27] and [Na, Corollary 2.4]. For A_n we find that the natural sufficient condition for elements of Γ_n to be central in A_n is far more restrictive. This is logical, as the centre of A_n is expected to be very small, as a consequence of the trivial centre of the universal enveloping algebra of the periplectic superalgebra, see [Go]. Let $\Bbbk[\underline{x}]^{\mathbb{S}_{n-1}} \subset \Gamma_n$ denote the symmetric polynomials in $\{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n\}$. In particular, $\Theta \in \Bbbk[\underline{x}]^{\mathbb{S}_{n-1}}$.

Theorem 6.4.2. *The subalgebra*

$$\Bbbk 1 \ \oplus \ \Theta\, \Bbbk[\underline{x}]^{\mathbb{S}_{n-1}},$$

with Θ *introduced in* (6.3)*, belongs to the centre of* A_n*.*

In general, the central elements in Theorem 6.4.2 will belong to the Jacobson radical of A_n.

Proposition 6.4.3. *We have* $\Theta L_{A_n}(\lambda) = 0$*, unless* $n = 3$*,* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \neq 3$ *and* $\lambda = (2, 1)$*.*

Now we start the proofs of the theorem and proposition. Recall the definition of I in 4.3.2. The following proposition implies Theorem 6.4.2.

Proposition 6.4.4. *Let* $f = f(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n)$ *be a symmetric polynomial in* $n-1$ *indeterminates evaluated in* $\{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n\}$*. Then* $f\,\Theta \in A_n$ *belongs to the centre of* A_n*. More precisely, we have*

$$w\, f\Theta \ = \ f\Theta\, w \quad \textit{for} \ \ w \in \mathbb{S}_n \qquad \textit{and} \qquad a\, f\Theta \ = \ 0 \ = \ f\Theta\, a \quad \textit{for} \ \ a \in I.$$

Proof. Set $g := f\Theta$. First we prove that $\varepsilon_k g = 0 = g\varepsilon_k$. For $2 \leq k < n$, g is of the form

$$g \ = \ \left((x_k - x_{k+1})^2 - 1\right) h\,(x_k, x_{k+1}) \tag{6.4}$$

with h a symmetric polynomial in two variables, with values in the algebra generated by $\{x_l \,|\, l \notin \{k, k+1\}\}$. The claim thus follows from Corollary 6.3.2(2). Using $x_2^2 = 1$, we can also write g as

$$((x_2 - x_3)^2 - 1)h'(x_2) = (x_3^2 - 2x_3x_2)h'(x_2), \tag{6.5}$$

for some polynomial h' in one variable with values in the algebra generated by $\{x_l \,|\, l > 2\}$. That g is annihilated by left and right multiplication with ε_1 then follows from equation (6.1).

The above proves that $ag = 0 = ga$ for all $a \in I$. Now we prove that $s_k g = g s_k$ for all $1 \leq k < n$. For $2 \leq k$, we consider again the expression in (6.4). The first factor commutes with s_k by Corollary 6.3.2(1). Lemma 6.3.2(3) and (4) imply that s_k commutes with any symmetric polynomial in x_k, x_{k+1}, up to terms containing ε_k. This and Lemma 6.3.3 imply that the second factor in (6.4) commutes with s_k up to terms which cancel the first factor. Hence, we find indeed $s_k g = g s_k$. For $k = 1$, we consider again the expression in (6.5). By Lemma 6.3.3, s_1 commutes with all factors in all terms except with x_2. By Lemma 6.3.1(2), we have $s_1 x_2 = x_2 s_1 + 2\varepsilon_1$. Hence, s_1 commutes with x_2 up to a term which cancels x_3 by equation (6.1), so $s_1 g = g s_1$. □

Proof of Proposition 6.4.3. By Proposition 6.4.4, $\Theta I = 0$. We can thus consider the action on $A_n/I \cong \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$, on which Θ acts as

$$\Theta^0 := \prod_{2 \leq i < j \leq n} \left(1 - (x_i^0 - x_j^0)^2\right).$$

The results thus follow immediately from [Ma1, Corollary 3.7] and [Ma1, Theorem 3.32]. □

In sharp contrast to the symmetric group and Brauer algebra, there is no linear term in Γ_n contained in the centre of A_n. This will be conceptually explained in 8.5.4.

Lemma 6.4.5. *If* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 2$*, the element* $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \in A_n$ *is central. When* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \neq 2$*, the only linear combinations of the Jucys-Murphy elements which are central in* A_n *are zero.*

7. On composition multiplicities and blocks

In this section we determine the blocks of the periplectic Brauer algebra A_n over fields with characteristic 0 or higher than n. The result is very different from the corresponding one for Brauer algebras in [CDM, Corollary 6.7]. As an extra result we obtain several decomposition multiplicities.

7.1. The blocks of A_n.

The main result will be stated in terms of 2-cores.

7.1.1. The 2-core of a partition, see [Ma1, § 5.3], is the partition obtained by iteratively removing rim 2-hooks from its Young diagram, until no more can be removed. Rim 2-hooks are just two adjacent boxes



such that both boxes lie on the lower-right edge of the Young diagram of the partition. The possible 2-cores are given by $\partial^i := (i, i-1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{P}_{\frac{1}{2}i(i+1)}$, so

$\partial^0 := \varnothing$, $\partial^1 :=$, $\partial^2 :=$, $\partial^3 :=$  , ...

Theorem 7.1.2. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$. *For* $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_A$, *the simple* A_n*-modules* $L_A(\lambda)$ *and* $L_A(\mu)$ *belong to the same block in* A_n-mod *if and only if* λ *and* μ *have the same* 2*-core.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof.

7.2. Decomposition multiplicities for C.

7.2.1. Assume $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$ and consider the standardly based algebra A_n. We are interested in the multiplicities

$$[W(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbf{L}_A = \Lambda_C \text{ and } \mu \in \Lambda_A.$$

This information is included in the decomposition multiplicities of the standard modules of C_n, by equation (4.11). We will focus on C_n, which allows to work with quasi-hereditary algebras, and introduce the short-hand notation

$$\Delta_n(\lambda) = \Delta_{C_n}(\lambda) \qquad \text{and} \qquad L_n(\lambda) = L_{C_n}(\lambda),$$

for standard and simple modules over C_n. The following lemma reduces the quest for multiplicities to those in the maximal degree for the $\mathbb{Z}$-grading on C_n.

Lemma 7.2.2. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2, n]$ *and consider* $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_{C_n} = \mathbf{L}_{C_n}$.

(1) If $i = |\mu|$, *we have*

$$[\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] = \begin{cases} [\Delta_i(\lambda) : L_i(\mu)] & \text{if } |\lambda| \leq i \\ 0 & \text{if } |\lambda| > i. \end{cases}$$

(2) If $\mu \neq \varnothing$, *the condition* $[\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] \neq 0$ *implies that* $\lambda \subset \mu$ *such that the boxes in* $\mu \backslash \lambda$ *can be paired up in a way that the contents of each pair differ by one.*

Proof. The case $|\lambda| > i$ is immediate by Theorem 3.2.2, as then $\lambda < \mu$. Assume therefore that $i \geq |\lambda|$. We have an exact Schur functor

$$C_n\text{-mod} \;\to\; C_i\text{-mod},$$

corresponding to the idempotent $e^* := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}(i)} e_k^*$, since by construction $C_i \cong e^* C_n e^*$. By equation (3.4), we have $e^* \Delta_n(\nu) \cong \Delta_i(\nu)$ for each $\nu \in \Lambda_{C_i}$. As $\Delta_n(\nu)$ has simple top $L_n(\nu)$ and $\Delta_i(\nu)$ has simple top $L_i(\nu)$, we furthermore find $e^* L_n(\nu) \cong L_i(\nu)$. This concludes the proof of part (1).

Part (2) follows immediately from part (1) and Corollary 6.2.7. □

Now we determine some properties of the $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$-module structure of the extremal degree in $\Delta_n(\lambda)$, which will be applied throughout the rest of the paper.

Lemma 7.2.3. *For* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$ *and* $\lambda \vdash n-2$*, we have*

$$\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n} e_n^* \Delta_n(\lambda) \;\cong\; \bigoplus_{\mu \in P} L^0(\mu),$$

where P *is the set of partitions* ν *of* n *with* $\lambda \subset \nu$*, such that the two boxes added to the Young diagram of* λ *to create* ν *are not in the same column.*

Proof. Using the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients in 2.5.5 we have

$$\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n} e_n^* \Delta_n(\lambda) \;\cong\; \bigoplus_{\mu \vdash n} L^0(\mu)^{\oplus c^{\mu}_{\lambda,(2)}}.$$

The claim then follows from the LR rule. □

A direct computation as in the proof of Lemma 6.2.3, and Lemma 6.2.4 imply the following.

Lemma 7.2.4. *For* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,2k]$*, if* $[\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{2k}} e_{2k}^* \Delta_{2k}(\varnothing) : L^0(\lambda)] \neq 0$*, then* $|\mathrm{res}(\lambda)| = k$*.*

There is only one partition $\lambda \vdash 4$ for which $|\mathrm{res}(\lambda)| = 2$, if $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$, which is $\lambda = (3,1)$. This leads to the following example.

7.2.5. *Example.* If $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$, we have $e_4^* \Delta_4(\varnothing) \cong L^0(3,1)$. If $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3,5\}$, we have

$$e_5^* \Delta_5(1) \cong L^0(4,1) \oplus L^0(3,2) \oplus L^0(3,1,1).$$

The decomposition of $e_5^* \Delta_5(1)$ follows immediately from $e_4^* \Delta_4(\varnothing)$ and the LR rule.

Proposition 7.2.6. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$*,* $\lambda \vdash i$ *and* $i+2 \in \mathcal{J}(n)$*. We have*

$$[\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] = 1$$

for any $\mu \vdash i+2$ *such that its Young diagram is obtained from that of* λ *by adding two boxes in the same row.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.2.2(1) we can assume $n = i+2$. By Lemma 7.2.3, we have

$$[\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n} e_n^* \Delta_n(\lambda) : L^0(\mu)] = 1.$$

It thus remains to prove that the subspace $L^0(\mu)$ is annihilated by left multiplication with any diagram containing a cap and hence constitutes a C_n-submodule. As $L^0(\mu)$ forms a $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$-submodule it actually suffices to prove that it is annihilated by $d \in e_{n-2}^* C_n e_n^*$, defined as

$d :=$

This left multiplication actually yields a $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{n-2} \times \mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_1$-module morphism from $L^0(\mu)$ to $L^0(\lambda)$. Furthermore, $d = -ds_{n-1}$, which implies that left multiplication with d annihilates any element of $L^0(\mu)$ which is $\mathbb{S}_1^{\times n-2} \times \mathbb{S}_2$-invariant. Hence, left multiplication with d will be zero on $L^0(\mu)$ if

$$[\mathrm{Res}_{\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_{n-2} \times \mathbb{S}_2} L^0(\mu) : L^0(\lambda) \otimes L^0(1,1)] = 0.$$

For the proposed choices of μ this is satisfied, as the LR rule implies $c^{\mu}_{\lambda,(1,1)} = 0$. □

In the following lemma and corollary, we take the convention that $L_n(\lambda) = 0$ when λ can not be sensibly interpreted as a partition.

Lemma 7.2.7. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$. *We have short exact sequences*

$$0 \to L_n(n) \oplus L_n(n-2,2) \to \Delta_n(n-2) \to L_n(n-2) \to 0,$$
$$0 \to L_n(3,1^{n-3}) \to \Delta_n(1^{n-2}) \to L_n(1^{n-2}) \to 0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 7.2.3, we have

$$e_n^*\Delta_n(n-2) \cong L^0(n) \oplus L^0(n-1,1) \oplus L^0(n-2,2) \quad \text{and}$$
$$e_n^*\Delta_n(n-2,1^{n-2}) \cong L^0(3,1^{n-3}) \oplus L^0(2,1^{n-2}).$$

By Proposition 7.2.6, $L^0(n) \oplus L^0(n-2,2)$ forms a C_n-submodule of $\Delta_n(n-2)$, while $L^0(3,1^{n-3})$ forms a C_n-submodule of $\Delta_n(1^{n-2})$. In both cases, the given subspace in $e_n^*\Delta_n(\lambda)$ which complements this submodule is simple as a $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$-module. When $n=2$ it is actually zero, when $n>2$, we have $e_n^*L(\lambda) \neq 0$ for λ equal to $(n-2)$ or 1^{n-2}, by equation (4.3). This shows that the remaining subspace in $e_n^*\Delta_n(\lambda)$ belongs to the top of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$, which concludes the proof. □

Corollary 7.2.8. *Let* $j,n \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $j+2 \in \mathcal{J}(n)$ *and* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$. *We have*

$$[\Delta_n(j) : L_n(j+2)] = 1 = [\Delta_n(j) : L_n(j,2)] = [\Delta_n(1^j) : L_n(3,1^{j-1})],$$

and all other multiplicities for $L_n(\lambda)$ *with* $\lambda \vdash j+2$ *vanish.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemmata 7.2.7 and 7.2.2(1). □

7.3. **Proof of Theorem 7.1.2.** First we observe that, by definition and the fact that all 2-cores are their own transpose, the 2-cores of λ and λ' are identical. We will use this property freely.

Proposition 7.3.1. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$. *If* $\lambda \vdash i$ *and* $\mu \vdash j$, *for* $i,j \in \mathcal{J}(n)$, *are partitions with the same 2-core, the simple modules* $L_n(\lambda)$ *and* $L_n(\mu)$ *belong to the same block in* C_n-mod.

Proof. Assume that κ is obtained from a partition ν by removing a rim two-hook, we claim that

$$[P_n(\nu) : L_n(\kappa)] \neq 0 \qquad \text{or} \qquad [P_n(\kappa) : L_n(\nu)] \neq 0. \tag{7.1}$$

From this it follows that any $L_n(\nu)$ is in the same block as the simple module for its 2-core, proving the proposition.

Now we prove equation (7.1). Assume first that ν is obtained from κ by adding two boxes in the same row. Proposition 7.2.6 implies that $[\Delta_n(\kappa) : L_n(\nu)] \neq 0$, so in particular $[P_n(\kappa) : L_n(\nu)] \neq 0$. Now assume that ν is obtained from κ by adding two boxes in the same column. Then we have $[\Delta_n(\kappa') : L_n(\nu')] \neq 0$, so by equation (3.1) we have $(P_n(\nu) : \Delta_n(\kappa)) \neq 0$, so in particular $[P_n(\nu) : L_n(\kappa)] \neq 0$. This concludes the proof. □

Theorem 7.1.2 now follows from the following two lemmata.

Lemma 7.3.2. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$. *If* $\lambda,\mu \in \Lambda_A$ *have the same 2-core,* $L_n(\lambda)$ *and* $L_n(\mu)$ *belong to the same block in* A_n-mod.

Proof. If λ and μ have the same 2-core, which is not $\partial^0 = \varnothing$, the result follows immediately from equation (7.1) and the fact that the exact functor $F = e_n^*-$ maps corresponding projective to projective and simple to simple modules, see Lemma 4.6.2 and equation (4.3).

If λ has 2-core $\varnothing$, the above reasoning shows that $L_A(\lambda)$ will be in the block of either $L_A(2)$ or $L_A(1,1)$. The claim then follows, by using the extra property that for C_n, we have $[P_n(1,1) : L_n(2)] \neq 0$, which is proved from $[\Delta_n(\varnothing) : L_n(2)] \neq 0$, as above. □

Lemma 7.3.3. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin [2,n]$. *If* $L(\lambda)$ *and* $L(\mu)$ *belong to the same block in* A_n-mod, *then one of the following equivalent conditions must hold:*

(1) the number of even minus the number of odd contents of λ *equals that of* μ;
(2) λ *and* μ *have the same 2-core.*

Proof. Assume first that $[W_n(\nu) : L_n(\kappa)] \neq 0$ for some $\nu, \kappa \in \Lambda_A$. By Lemma 7.2.2(2) and equation (4.11), the number of even minus the number of odd contents of ν equals that of κ. Note also that this difference between the number of odd and even contents is the same for ν and ν'.

If $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ are in the same block we must be able to construct a sequence $\lambda = \nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_k = \mu$ of partitions such that ν_i corresponds to a simple subquotient in the projective cover corresponding to ν_{i-1}. Theorem 4.1.2(4) (with Remark 4.6.4) and the previous paragraph imply that condition (1) must be satisfied.

Now we prove the equivalence of (1) and (2). Denote by $\gamma(\kappa)$ the number of boxes in the Young diagram of κ with even content minus the number of boxes with odd content. By construction, $\gamma(\nu) = \gamma(\lambda)$ if ν is obtained from λ by removing rim 2-hooks. We also have

$$\gamma(\partial^{2i-1}) = i \qquad \text{and} \qquad \gamma(\partial^{2i}) = -i, \qquad \text{for } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In conclusion, γ of a partition is the same as γ of its 2-core, and γ is different for each 2-core. Hence, conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent. □

Remark 7.3.4. It follows from Lemma 4.3.1(2) that any block in A_n-mod which does not correspond to the 2-core $\varnothing$ is equivalent to one in C_n-mod. Hence, A_n decomposes into a number of blocks, such that at most one is not quasi-hereditary.

8. Connections with the periplectic Lie superalgebra

Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We set $V = \Bbbk^{m|m}$, the $m|m$-dimensional superspace and we choose an *odd* supersymmetric non-degenerate bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on V. We will always assume that $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 0$, even though several statements are independent of characteristic.

8.1. Actions of A_n and $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ on tensor space.

8.1.1. We have the *right* action π_n of A_n on $V^{\otimes n}$, introduced in [Mo, §2]. This is determined by

$$\begin{aligned}(v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n)\pi_n(s_k) &= (-1)^{|v_k||v_{k+1}|}\, v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{k-1} \otimes v_{k+1} \otimes v_k \otimes v_{k+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n \\ (v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n)\pi_n(\varepsilon_k) &= \langle v_k, v_{k+1} \rangle\, v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{k-1} \otimes T \otimes v_{k+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n,\end{aligned}$$

where $T = \sum_{j=1}^{2m} (-1)^{|u_j|} u_j \otimes u_j^* \in V \otimes V$, for $\{u_j\}$ some homogeneous basis of V, with dual basis u_j^* with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Note that left and right dual basis mean the same thing for an odd supersymmetric form, and $(u_j^*)^* = u_j$. This yields an algebra morphism

$$\pi_n : A_n \to \mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(V^{\otimes n})^{\mathrm{op}}.$$

This extends canonically to an algebra morphism

$$C_n \to \mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(\otimes_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n)} V^{\otimes i})^{\mathrm{op}}, \tag{8.1}$$

see [KT, Theorem 5.2.1].

Since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \otimes V \to \Bbbk$ is an odd form (representing $\cup$) and $T \in V \otimes V$ is an odd element (representing $\cap$), the image of π_n consists only of even ($\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading preserving) morphisms of $V^{\otimes n}$.

8.1.2. The space $\mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(V)$, with multiplication given by the super commutator is the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}(V) \cong \mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$. We define the Killing form $(\cdot|\cdot)$ on $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ as

$$(X|Y) := \mathrm{Str}_V(XY), \qquad \text{for } X, Y \in \mathfrak{gl}(V),$$

the super trace of XY interpreted as an operator on V. For a (homogeneous) basis $\{X_a\}$ of $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$, we denote by $\{X_a^\dagger\}$ the basis satisfying $(X_a|X_b^\dagger) = \delta_{ab}$. Note that $(X_a^\dagger)^\dagger = (-1)^{|X_a|} X_a$.

For $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ and $1 \leq l \leq n$, we let $\mathrm{Id}^{\otimes n-l} \otimes X \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes l-1}$ act from the *left* on $\otimes^n V$ by

$$\left(\mathrm{Id}^{\otimes n-l} \otimes X \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes l-1}\right) v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n = (-1)^{|X|(|v_1|+\cdots+|v_{n-l}|)} v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{n-l} \otimes X v_{n-l+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n.$$

For $1 \leq k \leq n$, we have the corresponding tensor product action, leading to a morphism of associative algebras

$$\Delta_k : U(\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)) \to \mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(V^{\otimes n}); \quad \Delta_k(X) = \sum_{0 \leq l < k} \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes l} \otimes X \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes (n-l-1)}, \quad \text{for } X \in \mathfrak{gl}(m|m).$$

8.2. **The periplectic Lie superalgebra.**

8.2.1. We define an involutive anti-algebra automorphism θ of $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$, which is determined by the property

$$\langle Xv, w \rangle \; = \; -(-1)^{|v||X|} \langle v, \theta(X) w \rangle,$$

for all $v, w \in V$, for a fixed $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$.

The *periplectic Lie superalgebra* $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$ is the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$ of elements satisfying $\theta(X) = X$. It follows that $\dim_{\Bbbk} \mathfrak{pe}(m) = m^2|m^2$ and $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$ is a maximal degenerate subspace for $(\cdot|\cdot)$.

8.2.2. From now on, unless stated otherwise, we will consider $V^{\otimes n}$ as a $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-module, for the restriction of Δ_n. The algebras A_n and $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$ are defined in such a way that the action of A_n in Section 8.1 actually gives an algebra morphism

$$\pi_n : A_n \; \to \; \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}(V^{\otimes n})^{\mathrm{op}}. \tag{8.2}$$

In other words, the subalgebras $\pi_n(A_n)$ and $\Delta_n(U(\mathfrak{pe}(m)))$ commute in $\mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(V^{\otimes n})$.

8.2.3. If $m \geq n$, then π_n in (8.2) is an isomorphism by [Mo, Theorems 4.1 and 4.5]. The algebra A_n hence represents the full centraliser of the action of $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))$ on $V^{\otimes n}$ under those conditions. Whether we have a double centraliser property is an interesting open question.

Question 8.2.4. Is the algebra morphism $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m)) \to \mathrm{End}_{A_n}(V^{\otimes n})$ surjective, for any $m \geq n$?

For $n \in \{2, 3\}$, the answer is affirmative, as can be checked directly from the explicit description of the $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-module $\otimes^n V$ in [Mo, Section 6].

8.2.5. We consider the standard triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{pe}(m) = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$, of *e.g.* [Se2, §2], which satisfies

$$\dim_{\Bbbk} \mathfrak{n}^+ = \frac{1}{2}m(m-1)|\frac{1}{2}m(m+1) \quad \text{and} \quad \dim_{\Bbbk} \mathfrak{n}^- = \frac{1}{2}m(m-1)|\frac{1}{2}m(m-1).$$

The positive odd roots are given by $\delta_i + \delta_j$, for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq m$, and the negative odd roots are $-\delta_i - \delta_j$, for $1 \leq i < j \leq m$.

With respect to this system of positive roots, we denote the simple module with highest weight $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ by $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. For instance, we have $V \cong \mathcal{L}(\delta_1)$ and $\Bbbk \cong \mathcal{L}(0)$. The necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{L}(\alpha_1\delta_1 + \cdots + \alpha_m\delta_m)$ to be finite dimensional is $\alpha_i - \alpha_j \in \mathbb{N}$. We call the corresponding highest weights integral dominant and denote the set by $X^+ \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$.

To a partition $\lambda \vdash d$ which satisfies $\lambda_{m+1} = 0$, we associate an integral dominant weight

$$\underline{\lambda} := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i \delta_i \; \in X^+.$$

8.2.6. By construction, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_n & \xrightarrow{\pi_n} & \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}(V^{\otimes n})^{\mathrm{op}} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \Bbbk \mathbb{S}_n & \xrightarrow{\pi_n} & \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)}(V^{\otimes n})^{\mathrm{op}}. \end{array}$$

Corollary 8.2.7. *For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{A_n}$, the corresponding primitive idempotent $e_\lambda \in A_n$ is not annihilated by π_n if $\lambda_{m+1} = 0$. Furthermore, we have $[\otimes^n V e_\lambda : \mathcal{L}(\underline{\lambda})] \neq 0$.*

Proof. Assume first that $\lambda \vdash n$ and let e be a primitive idempotent in $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$ corresponding to λ. Under the inclusion $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n \hookrightarrow A_n$, the idempotent e does not necessarily remain primitive, but in its decomposition as a sum of orthogonal primitive idempotents in A_n, e_λ (up to conjugation) must appear, by Corollary 4.3.3. Considering $A_n \twoheadrightarrow \Bbbk\mathbb{S}_n$ shows that $e - e_\lambda \in I$.

Now assume that $\pi_n(e_\lambda) = 0$, which thus implies that $\pi_n(e) \in \pi_n(I)$. By construction, every $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-morphism of $V^{\otimes n}$ in $\pi_n(I)$ factors through $V^{\otimes n-2}$. However, if $\lambda_{m+1} = 0$, [BR] implies that the $\mathfrak{pe}(m|m)$-module $\otimes^n V\mathrm{e}$, which is the restriction of a non-zero simple highest weight module of $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$, contains a space of weight $\underline{\lambda}$. As this weight space does not appear in $\otimes^{n-2}V$, we obtain a contradiction. Moreover, this shows that $[\otimes^n V e_\lambda : \mathcal{L}(\underline{\lambda})] \neq 0$.

Now we consider the general case $\lambda \vdash i \in \mathcal{J}^0(n)$. By Lemma 4.6.5, we can take $e_\lambda = a_i e_\lambda^{(i)} b_i$. We can analyse this using the morphism in equation (8.1). By definition, $a_i : V^{\otimes n} \to V^{\otimes i}$ is a surjective, and $b_i : V^{\otimes i} \to V^{\otimes n}$ injective. This shows that $\pi_i(e_\lambda^{(i)})$ is zero if and only if $\pi_n(e_\lambda)$ is zero. The fact that $\pi_n(e_\lambda) \neq 0$ thus follows the previous paragraph. This reasoning also shows that the property $[\otimes^n V e_\lambda : \mathcal{L}(\underline{\lambda})] \neq 0$ extends. □

Remark 8.2.8. The proof of Corollary 8.2.7 and [Mo, §6] show that $V^{\otimes n} e_{(2)}$ also contains the trivial module $\mathcal{L}(0)$ as a subquotient.

8.3. **The blocks of $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$.** Let $\mathcal{F}_m$ be the category of finite dimensional weight modules over $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$, where the morphisms are given by all $\Bbbk$-morphisms (not necessarily even) which commute with the $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-action. This category is abelian, see [Ch, §2.3]. The simple objects of $\mathcal{F}_m$ are given by $\{\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \,|\, \alpha \in X^+\}$. In [Ch] some interesting partial results concerning the block decomposition of $\mathcal{F}_m$ were obtained, which we complete now. Recall the 2-cores $\{\partial^i\}$ from 7.1.1.

Proposition 8.3.1. *Let n be strictly bigger than $\frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$. The image of*

$$\pi_n \oplus \pi_{n-1} \;:\; A_n \oplus A_{n-1} \;\to\; \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}(V^{\otimes n} \oplus V^{\otimes n-1})$$

is an algebra with at least $m+1$ blocks. We have a decomposition of $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-modules

$$V^{\otimes n} \oplus V^{\otimes n-1} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m} M_i^n.$$

There are no morphisms in the image of $\pi_n \oplus \pi_{n-1}$ between M_i^n and M_j^n if $i \neq j$. Furthermore, $[M_i : \mathcal{L}(\underline{\partial}^i)] \neq 0$, for $0 \leq i \leq m$.

Proof. We clearly have

$$\mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}(V^{\otimes n} \oplus V^{\otimes n-1}) \;=\; \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}(V^{\otimes n}) \oplus \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}(V^{\otimes n-1}),$$

as $\mathfrak{h}$ already separates between the two tensor powers.

First we work with the set of partitions $\{\tilde{\partial}^i\}$ where $\tilde{\partial}^i = \partial^i$ for $i > 0$ and $\tilde{\partial}^0 = (2)$. For $0 \leq i \leq m$, we have $0 < |\tilde{\partial}^i| < n$, so $\tilde{\partial}^i \in \Lambda_{A_n} \cup \Lambda_{A_{n-1}}$. As $(\tilde{\partial}^i)_{m+1} = 0$, for each $0 \leq i \leq m$, the corresponding idempotents are not in the kernel of $\pi_n \oplus \pi_{n-1}$, by Corollary 8.2.7(1). Theorem 7.1.2 then implies that $m+1$ blocks of $A_n \oplus A_{n-1}$ are not annihilated by $\pi_n \oplus \pi_{n-1}$.

This immediately implies the existence of the decomposition $\oplus_i M_i$ and the vanishing of morphisms between the different modules. The conclusion about the non-vanishing multiplicities then follows from Corollary 8.2.7 and Remark 8.2.8. □

We will also need the following observation about the injective modules in $\mathcal{F}_m$.

Lemma 8.3.2. *Every injective envelope in $\mathcal{F}_m$ is a direct summand of some power $V^{\otimes n}$.*

Proof. We consider the exact restriction functor $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}$. By the PBW theorem, the induction from $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))$ to $U(\mathfrak{gl}(m|m))$ yields an exact functor. Hence, $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)}_{\mathfrak{pe}(m)}$ maps injective modules

to injective modules. It then follows from Frobenius reciprocity that any injective hull in $\mathcal{F}_m$ is a direct summand of an injective $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$-module, after restriction. By [BS, Theorem 3.6] and [Se2, §3.1], any injective $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$-module is a direct summand of some $V^{\otimes r} \otimes (V^*)^{\otimes s}$, with $V = \Bbbk^{m|m}$ the natural $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$-module and V^* its dual. As $V \cong V^*$ for $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$, this concludes the proof. □

8.3.3. It is announced by Serganova in [Se2, Theorem 3.5] that the π_n in equation (8.2) is always surjective. This implies that there are no $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-morphisms between the different M_i^n in Proposition 8.3.1. We let $\mathcal{F}_m(\alpha)$ denote the block containing $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$, for any $\alpha \in X^+$.

Proposition 8.3.4. *$\mathcal{F}_m$ contains at least $m+1$ blocks, given by $\mathcal{F}_m(\underline{\partial}^i)$, for $0 \leq i \leq m$.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.3.2 there is some $n_1 > \frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$ such that the injective envelopes I_j of the modules $\mathcal{L}(\underline{\partial}^j)$ are direct summands of $V^{\otimes n_1} \oplus V^{\otimes n_1 - 1}$. Clearly I_j is a direct summand of $M_j^{n_1}$, by 8.3.3. Assume now that I_j and $I_{j'}$ belong to the same block in $\mathcal{F}_m$, for $j \neq j'$. There must be a finite collection of injective modules $\{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_k\}$ in $\mathcal{F}_m$ such that there is always a morphism $K_i \to K_{i+1}$ or $K_{i+1} \to K_i$ and such that there is some morphism between I_j and K_1, and between $I_{j'}$ and K_k. By Lemma 8.3.2, there exists $n_2 \geq n_1$ such that all of these injective modules are direct summands of $V^{\otimes n_2} \oplus V^{\otimes n_2 - 1}$. By the existence of morphisms between them, they must all be contained in $M_{j_0}^{n_2}$ for one fixed j_0, which implies $j = j_0 = j'$, a contradiction. This means there are at least $m+1$ blocks. □

We recall the equivalence relation $\sim$ on X^+ introduced in [Ch, Definition 5.1]. This relation is transitively generated by

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \sim \alpha + 2\delta_k, & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq m, \text{ provided } \alpha + 2\delta_k \in X^+; \\ \alpha \sim \alpha + (\delta_k + \delta_l), & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq l \leq m, \text{ provided } \alpha + (\delta_k + \delta_l) \in X^+ \text{ and } \alpha_k = \alpha_l. \end{cases}$$

We state a recent result of [Ch, §5] and [Ch, Theorem A.2].

Lemma 8.3.5 (C.W. Chen)**.** *If $\alpha \sim \beta$, for $\alpha, \beta \in X^+$, the modules $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ belong to the same block in $\mathcal{F}_m$. Hence, there are at most $m+1$ blocks in $\mathcal{F}_m$.*

The combination of Lemma 8.3.5 and Proposition 8.3.4 implies the following theorem.

Theorem 8.3.6. *The modules $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ are in the same block of $\mathcal{F}_m$ if and only if $\alpha \sim \beta$. The block decomposition of $\mathcal{F}_m$ is thus given by*

$$\mathcal{F}_m \;=\; \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m} \mathcal{F}_m(\underline{\partial}^i)$$

Theorem 8.3.6 and Lemma 8.3.5 provide a complete description of linkage in $\mathcal{F}_m$.

Remark 8.3.7. Entova Aizenbud and Serganova informed the author that in work in preparation, they make a study of Kazhdan-Lusztig multiplicities in $\mathcal{F}_m$, which will in particular confirm Theorem 8.3.6.

8.4. **The centre.** If the answer to question 8.2.4 is affirmative, the centre of A_n should coincide with the centre of the quotient of $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))$ with the annihilator ideal of $\otimes^n V$, for any $m \geq n$.

8.4.1. For m indeterminates t_i we introduce a symmetric polynomial, resembling Θ in (6.3),

$$f_\Theta(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m) := \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq m} (t_i - t_j - 1) \;\in\; \Bbbk[t_1, \ldots, t_m]^{\mathbb{S}_m}. \tag{8.3}$$

Based on the work on Serganova, we then have the following lemma.

Lemma 8.4.2. *[V. Serganova] Let K be a two-sided ideal in $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))$ which contains all products of $\frac{1}{2}m(m-1)+1$ positive odd root vectors. For any symmetric polynomial f in m variables in the ideal (f_Θ), we have a (possibly zero) central element $S^f \in U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))/K$. For any $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-highest weight vector v^+ of weight*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\alpha_i + i - \frac{1}{2}(m+1)\right)\delta_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*, \tag{8.4}$$

for which $Kv^+ = 0$, we have

$$S^f v^+ = f(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_m)v^+.$$

Proof. Take an arbitrary symmetric polynomial f_0. By the Harish-Chandra isomorphism for $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$, there is a corresponding z in the centre of $U(\mathfrak{gl}(m))$ such that $zv^+ = f_0(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)v^+$ for a $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$-highest weight vector of weight (8.4). Then [Se2, Lemma 4.6(b)] defines S_z in $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))$ which acts as $(f_0 f_\Theta)(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ on any $\mathfrak{pe}(m|m)$-highest weight vector of the weight (8.4). Now set $f := f_0 f_\Theta$. The fact that $S^f := S_z + K$ is central in $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))/K$ can then be proved precisely as in the proof of [Se2, Lemma 4.6]. □

8.4.3. By weight considerations, we see that the annihilator ideal in $U(\mathfrak{pe}(m))$ of $\otimes^n V$, for $n \leq m$, satisfies the condition on K in Lemma 8.4.2. This explains the clear connection between Theorem 6.4.2 and Lemma 8.4.2. Set $S_\Theta := S^{f_\Theta}$. The following then explains Proposition 6.4.3.

Lemma 8.4.4. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a simple $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$-module appearing as a subquotient in $\otimes^n V$, for $2 \leq n \leq m$. Then S_Θ acts trivially on $\mathcal{L}$ unless $n = m = 3$ and $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(2\delta_1 + \delta_2)$.*

Proof. By equation (8.3), S_Θ acts non-trivially on $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in X^+$ if and only if

$$\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \cdots > \alpha_m. \tag{8.5}$$

Moreover, by [Se1, Lemma 3.1], equation (8.5) implies that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ has a non-zero vector of weight

$$\beta := \alpha - (m-1)(\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \cdots + \delta_m).$$

Demanding that α satisfies (8.5), while both α and β are weights which appear inside $\otimes^n V$ quickly reduces to $n \in \{2, 3\}$. These cases are described in [Mo, §6], from which the conclusion follows. □

8.5. **Alternative realisation of A_n and the Jucys-Murphy elements.** Using $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$ and $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$, we introduce some operators on $V^{\otimes n}$.

8.5.1. We choose a homogeneous basis $\{X_a \,|\, a = 1, \ldots, m^2\}$ of $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$, and take the homogeneous basis $\{X_{m^2+b} |\, 1 \leq b \leq m^2\}$ of the eigenspace of $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$ for θ with eigenvalue -1 given by $X_{m^2+b} = X_b^\dagger$. For clarity, we will use i as an index to sum from 1 to $2m^2$ and a or b to sum from 1 to m^2, so X_a and $X_{m^2+b}^\dagger$ will be elements in $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$.

8.5.2. For $1 \leq k < n$, we set

$$\sigma_k := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 2m^2} \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes k-1} \otimes X_i^\dagger \otimes X_i \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes n-k-1} \;\in \mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(\otimes^n V).$$

It is easily checked, for instance by considering a basis of V, that $\sigma_k = \pi_n(s_k)$. We also set

$$c_k := \sum_{1 \leq a \leq 2m^2} \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes k-1} \otimes \left((-1)^{|X_a|} X_a \otimes X_a^\dagger - X_a^\dagger \otimes X_a\right) \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes n-k-1} \;\in \mathrm{End}_{\Bbbk}(\otimes^n V).$$

It follows from a direct computation that $c_k = \pi_n(\varepsilon_k)$.

8.5.3. Now, for $2 \leq k \leq n$, we introduce

$$\xi_k := 2 \sum_{1 \leq a \leq m^2} (-1)^{|X_a|} \Delta_{k-1}(X_a) \otimes X_a^\dagger \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes n-k}.$$

It follows from 8.5.2 that $\xi_k = \pi_n(x_k)$, the image of the Jucys-Murphy elements of A_n. Consider the embedding of A_{k-1} in A_n of 2.1.7. It follows from equation (8.2), or more presicely its analogue for $n = k-1$, that ξ_k commutes with $\pi_n(A_{k-1}) = \pi_{k-1}(A_{k-1}) \otimes \mathrm{Id}^{\otimes n-k+1}$. For $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 0$, this hence yields an alternative proof of Lemma 6.1.2.

8.5.4. The restriction of the Killing form from $\mathfrak{gl}(m|m)$ to $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$ is zero, instead of non-degenerate. Consequently, the elements $X_a^\dagger$ do not belong to $\mathfrak{pe}(m)$, meaning that $\sum_{k=2}^n \xi_k$ does not correspond to $\Delta_n(\mathcal{C}_2)$, with $\mathcal{C}_2$ a Casimir operator, as would be the case for $\mathfrak{osp}(p|2q)$, see e.g. [Na, §2].

9. Some examples

We will determine algebra structures and decomposition multiplicities for A_n with $n \leq 5$.

9.1. The algebras A_2 and C_2.

Theorem 9.1.1. *If* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \neq 2$*, the algebra* A_2 *is the hereditary algebra given by the path algebra of the quiver* $\mathcal{Q}_2$*:*



Proof. The algebra A_2 has a basis given by 1, $s = s_1$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$. We have orthogonal primitive idempotents

$$e_1 = \frac{1}{2}(1-s) \quad \text{and} \quad e_2 = \frac{1}{2}(1+s),$$

for which we find $\varepsilon = e_2 \varepsilon e_1$ and $1 = e_1 + e_2$. The identification with the labelling set $\mathcal{P}_2$ of simple modules in Theorem 4.1.2(1) follows easily, which completes the proof. □

Similarly one proves the following theorem.

Theorem 9.1.2. *If* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \neq 2$*, the algebra* C_2 *is the hereditary algebra given by the path algebra of the quiver* $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_2$*:*



9.1.3. Continue assuming $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \neq 2$. By Theorem 9.1.1, we find that A_2 is quasi-hereditary for the two linear orders on its poset $\Lambda_A = \mathcal{P}_2$. Each case gives a corresponding standardly based structure, see 2.3.2, for which the cell modules are the standard modules and hence form a standard system. However, the standardly based structure of Theorem 4.1.2(2) is given in terms of the set $L = \{\varnothing, (2), (1,1)\} = \Lambda_C$, totally ordered by $\trianglelefteq$. Theorem 9.1.2 allows to calculate the standard modules of C_2 for this order, from which we find the corresponding cell modules of A_2:

$$W_A(\varnothing) \cong L_A(2) \cong W_A(2) \quad \text{and} \quad W_A(1,1) \cong L_A(1,1). \tag{9.1}$$

Corollary 9.1.4. *Set* $p := \mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \geq 0$*.*

(1) The cell modules of A_2 *from Theorem 4.1.2(2) do not form a standard system.*
(2) The algebra A_2 *admits a cellular datum as in* [GL, Definition 1.1] *if and only if* $p = 2$*.*
(3) If $p \neq 2$*, the double centraliser property in Theorem 4.4.3 is not true for* A_2 *and* C_2*.*

Proof. Assume $p \neq 2$. By equation (9.1), there are two cell modules which are isomorphic, so they do not form a standard system. Assume $p = 2$, then the conclusion in part (1) follows from [CZ, Lemma 9.3.2(1)], or directly from Remark 9.1.5. This proves part (1).

By [GL, (C1)], the dimension of a cellular algebra is the sum of squares of integers. As the dimension of A_2 is 3, the only possible such sum is $3 = 1^2 + 1^2 + 1^2$. However, [GL, (C2)] then implies that A_2 must admit an anti-involution which is the identity. As A_2 is not commutative when $p \neq 2$, it does not admit a cellular datum. When $p = 2$, it is well-known that $A_2 \cong B_2(0)$ admits a cellular datum, see [GL, Theorem 4.10]. This proves part (2).

For part (3) one sees directly that $\mathrm{End}_A(X)^{\mathrm{op}}$ is Morita equivalent to A, so different from C. □

Remark 9.1.5. For completeness, we mention that, when $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 2$, we have

$$A_2 \;\cong\; B_2(0) \cong \Bbbk[x, y]/(x^2, xy, y^2).$$

9.2. The algebra A_3.

Theorem 9.2.1. *If* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2, 3\}$*, the algebras* A_3 *and* C_3 *are hereditary algebras, Morita equivalent to the path algebra of the quiver* $\mathcal{Q}_3$*:*



Proof. By Theorems 3.2.2 and 4.1.1(1), A_3 is Morita equivalent to C_3 and quasi-hereditary. We work with C_3. If $\alpha \neq (1)$, then $\Delta(\alpha)$ is simple. Lemma 7.2.7 implies that the unique proper submodule of $\Delta(1)$ is $L(3)$. Using the BGG reciprocity in Theorem 3.2.2 then implies

$$P(2,1) \cong L(2,1), \quad P(3) \cong L(3) \quad \text{and} \quad P(1) \cong \Delta(1),$$

as well as a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \Delta(1) \to P(1,1,1) \to L(1,1,1) \to 0.$$

As $(C_3, \leq)$ is quasi-hereditary, there is no first extension between $L(1,1,1)$ and $L(3)$. Hence the structure of all indecomposable projective modules is completely determined and corresponds to the path algebra. As the quiver has no closed paths, the algebras are hereditary. □

9.3. The algebras A_4 and C_4.

Theorem 9.3.1. *If* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$*, the algebra* C_4 *is Morita equivalent to the path algebra of the quiver* $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_4$*:*



with relations $d_2 \circ d_1 = 0$*,* $d_3 \circ d_1 = 0$*,* $u_1 \circ u_2 = 0$*,* $u_3 \circ d_3 = 0$ *and* $u_1 \circ u_3 = 0$*.*

Proof. By Corollary 7.2.8, we have $[\Delta(\varnothing) : L(2)] = 1$ and $[\Delta(\varnothing) : L(1,1)] = 0$. By Example 7.2.5, $e_4^*\Delta(\varnothing)$ is a simple $\Bbbk\mathbb{S}_4$-module and hence belongs to one simple C_4-subquotient. As $e_4^*L(2) \neq 0$, by equation (4.3), we find $e_4^*\Delta(\varnothing) = e_4^*L(2)$, proving $[\Delta(\varnothing) : L(\lambda)] = 0$, for any $\lambda \vdash 4$.

By Lemma 7.2.7, the maximal submodule of $\Delta(2)$ decomposes into $L(4)$ and $L(2,2)$. Also by Lemma 7.2.7, the unique proper submodule of $\Delta(1,1)$ is $L(3,1)$. Using the BGG reciprocity in Theorem 3.2.2 then determines the standard filtrations of the projective modules. The requirement that $(C_4, \leq)$ be quasi-hereditary then allows to derive the explicit structure of the projective modules and these correspond to the projective modules of the proposed path algebra. □

Theorem 9.3.1 and equation (4.3) then immediately lead to the following result.

Theorem 9.3.2. *If* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$*, the algebra* A_4 *is Morita equivalent to the path algebra of the quiver* $\mathcal{Q}_4$*:*



with relations $d_2 \circ l_1 = 0$*,* $d_3 \circ l_1 = 0$*,* $l_1 \circ u_2 = 0$*,* $u_3 \circ d_3 = 0$ *and* $l_1 \circ u_3 = 0$*.*

Corollary 9.3.3. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$*.*

(1) The algebra A_4 *has infinite global dimension.*
(2) The cell modules of A_4 *from Theorem 4.1.2 do not form a standard system.*

Proof. From Theorem 9.3.2, it follows that we can construct an exact sequence

$$0 \to L(2) \to P(1,1) \to P(4) \oplus P(2,2) \to P(2) \to L(2) \to 0.$$

From this it easily follows that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^{3k}_{A_4}(L(2), L(2)) \neq 0, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

proving part (1).

From the structure of the standard modules for C_4 in the proof of Theorem 9.3.1, it follows that $W(\varnothing) \cong L(2)$ and $W(4) \cong L(4)$. The Gabriel quiver in Theorem 9.3.2 thus clearly shows that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_{A_4}(W(\varnothing), W(4)) \neq 0,$$

even though $(4) \trianglelefteq \varnothing$, concluding the proof of part (2). □

9.4. **Koszulity.** Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quiver and J an ideal in the (free) path algebra $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}$ generated by elements $\beta \circ \alpha$ for arrows α and β in $\mathcal{Q}$. The algebra $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}/J$ is then naturally quadratic in the sense of [BGS, Definition 1.2.2], so in particular positively graded. All quotients of free path algebras constructed above are of this form. They are even Koszul, in the sense of [BGS, Definition 1.2.1].

Proposition 9.4.1. *For $n < 5$ and $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$, the algebras A_n and C_n are Morita equivalent to Koszul algebras. More precisely:*

(1) If $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \neq 2$, the algebras $A_2 \cong \Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_2$ and $C_2 \cong \Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_3$ are Koszul. The algebra A_2 is Koszul self-dual, but C_2 is not.

(2) If $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$, the algebra $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_3$ is a Koszul, but not Koszul self-dual.

(3) Let J, resp. $\overline{J}$, be the ideals generated by the relations in Theorems 9.3.2, resp. 9.3.1. If $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3\}$, the algebras $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_4/J$ and $\Bbbk\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_4/\overline{J}$ are Koszul, but not Koszul self-dual.

Proof. The algebra $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_2$ is quadratic with

$$(\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_2)_1 \otimes_{(\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_2)_0} (\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_2)_1 = 0.$$

Such an algebra its own quadratic dual, see [BGS, Definition 2.8.1]. The algebra is clearly Koszul and the Koszul self-duality follows from [BGS, Theorem 2.10.1]. The Koszulity of $\Bbbk\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_2$ is also obvious. However the algebra is not quadratic self-dual and hence not Koszul self-dual. This concludes part (1). We have $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_3 \cong \Bbbk\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_2 \oplus \Bbbk$, so part (2) follows from part (1).

The Koszulity in part (3) follows from careful construction of the minimal projective resolutions of the simple modules. The algebra A_4 has infinite global dimension, by Corollary 9.3.3(1). The Koszul dual of $\mathcal{Q}_4/J$ is therefore infinite dimensional, disproving Koszul self-duality. The projective resolution of $L(\varnothing)$ shows that $\mathrm{Ext}^4_A(L(\varnothing), L(\varnothing))$ does not vanish, while the graded length of C_4 is only three. This prevents Koszul self-duality and thus concludes the proof of part (3). □

Remark 9.4.2. It is easily checked that the Koszul dual algebra of $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_3$ is actually isomorphic to the Ringel dual of $\Bbbk\mathcal{Q}_3$, for quasi-hereditary structure of Theorem 3.2.2.

9.5. **The algebras A_5 and C_5.** We determine all composition multiplicities for A_5.

Proposition 9.5.1. *Assume $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) \notin \{2,3,5\}$. The standard modules for A_5 or C_5 have the following Jordan-Hölder multiplicities:*

$$[\Delta(1)] = [L(1)] + [L(3)] + [L(3,2)], \quad [\Delta(2,1)] = [L(2,1)] + [L(4,1)],$$

$$[\Delta(3)] = [L(3)] + [L(5)] + [L(3,2)], \quad [\Delta(1,1,1)] = [L(1,1,1)] + [L(3,1,1)],$$

$$\text{and } [\Delta(\lambda)] = [L(\lambda)], \quad \text{for all } \lambda \vdash 5.$$

Proof. The statements for $\Delta(3)$ and $\Delta(1,1,1)$ follow from Lemma 7.2.7. Now we consider $\Delta(2,1)$. By Lemma 7.2.3, we have

$$e_5^*\Delta(2,1) \;\cong\; L^0(4,1)\oplus L^0(3,2)\oplus L^0(3,1,1)\oplus L^0(2,2,1).$$

By Proposition 7.2.6, $L^0(4,1)$ constitutes a C_5-submodule. The other spaces are prohibited to form subquotients by Theorem 7.1.2.

By Corollary 7.2.8, we have $[\Delta(1):L(3)]=1$ and $[\Delta(1):L(3,\lambda)]=0$ if $|\lambda|=3$ and $\lambda\neq(3)$. By Example 7.2.5 we have

$$e_5^*\Delta(1) \;\cong\; L^0(4,1)\oplus L^0(3,2)\oplus L^0(3,1,1).$$

From the proof of Lemma 7.2.7, we find that $L^0(4,1)$ belongs to $e_5^*L(3)$. Using the LR rule it follows that there is a two-dimensional space of $\mathbb{S}_3\times\mathbb{S}_2$-invariants in $e_5^*\Delta(1)$, contained in $L^0(4,1)\oplus L^0(3,2)$. One easily constructs such an invariant v which is annihilated by all diagrams containing a cap. Then $\mathbb{S}_5 v$ forms a C_5-submodule. As $L^0(4,1)$ does not constitute a submodule, $L^0(3,2)$ constitutes a submodule. Equation (4.3) implies that $e_5^*L(1)\neq 0$, so the remaining space $L^0(3,1,1)$ belongs to $L(1)$. This implies that $\Delta(1)$ does not contain any further simple C_5-subquotients. □

Acknowledgement. The research was supported by Australian Research Council Discover-Project Grant DP140103239 and an FWO postdoctoral grant. The author thanks Andrew Mathas and Ruibin Zhang for useful discussions.

References

[BGS] A. Beilinson, V. Ginzburg, W. Soergel: Koszul duality patterns in representation theory. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 2, 473–527.

[BSR] G. Benkart, C. L. Shader, A. Ram: Tensor product representations for orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **130** (1998), no. 1, 1–48.

[BR] A. Berele, A. Regev: Hook Young diagrams with applications to combinatorics and to representations of Lie superalgebras. Adv. in Math. **64** (1987), no. 2, 118–175.

[BS] J. Brundan, C. Stroppel: Highest weight categories arising from Khovanov's diagram algebra IV: the general linear supergroup. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **14** (2012), no. 2, 373–419.

[Ch] C.W Chen: Finite-dimensional representations of periplectic Lie superalgebras. J. Algebra **443** (2015), 99–125.

[CPS] E. Cline, B. Parshall, L. Scott: Finite-dimensional algebras and highest weight categories. J. Reine Angew. Math. **391** (1988), 85–99.

[CZ] K. Coulembier, R.B. Zhang: Borelic pairs for stratified algebras. arXiv:1607.01867.

[CDM] A. Cox, M. De Visscher, P. Martin: The blocks of the Brauer algebra in characteristic zero. Represent. Theory **13** (2009), 272–308.

[De] P. Deligne: La catégorie des représentations du groupe symétrique S_t, lorsque t n'est pas un entier naturel. Algebraic groups and homogeneous spaces, 209–273, Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Stud. Math., Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Mumbai, 2007.

[DR] V. Dlab, C.M. Ringel: The module theoretical approach to quasi-hereditary algebras. Representations of algebras and related topics (Kyoto, 1990), 200–224, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **168**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[DuR] J. Du, H. Rui: Based algebras and standard bases for quasi-hereditary algebras. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), no. 8, 3207–3235.

[ES] M. Ehrig, C. Stroppel: Schur-Weyl duality for the Brauer algebra and the ortho-symplectic Lie superalgebra. Math. Z. (2016). doi:10.1007/s00209-016-1669-y. arXiv:1412.7853.

[En] J. Enyang: Specht modules and semisimplicity criteria for Brauer and Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras. J. Algebraic Combin. **26** (2007), no. 3, 291–341.

[Go] M. Gorelik: The center of a simple P-type Lie superalgebra. J. Algebra **246** (2001), no. 1, 414–428.

[GL] J.J. Graham, G.I. Lehrer: Cellular algebras. Invent. Math. **123** (1996), no. 1, 1–34.

[HP] R. Hartmann, R. Paget: Young modules and filtration multiplicities for Brauer algebras. Math. Z. **254** (2006), no. 2, 333–357.

[Ja] G. James: The representation theory of the symmetric groups. Springer LNM **682**, 1978.

[KN] A. Kleshchev, D. Nakano: On comparing the cohomology of general linear and symmetric groups. Pacific J. Math. **201** (2001), no. 2, 339–355.

[KT] J.R. Kujawa, B.C. Tharp: The marked Brayer category. arXiv:1411.6929.

[KX] S. König, C.C. Xi: A characteristic free approach to Brauer algebras. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 4, 1489–1505.
[LR] R. Leduc, A. Ram: A ribbon Hopf algebra approach to the irreducible representations of centralizer algebras: the Brauer, Birman-Wenzl, and type A Iwahori-Hecke algebras. Adv. Math. **125** (1997), no. 1, 1–94.
[LZ1] G.I. Lehrer, R.B. Zhang: The Brauer category and invariant theory. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **17** (2015), 2311–2351.
[LZ2] G.I. Lehrer, R.B. Zhang: The first fundamental theorem of invariant theory for the orthosymplectic supergroup. Commun. Math. Phys. (2016). doi:10.1007/s00220-016-2731-7.
[Ma1] A. Mathas: Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group. University Lecture Series, **15**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
[Ma2] A. Mathas: Seminormal forms and Gram determinants for cellular algebras. With an appendix by Marcos Soriano. J. Reine Angew. Math. **619** (2008), 141–173.
[Mo] D. Moon: Tensor product representations of the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{p}(n)$ and their centralizers. Comm. Algebra **31** (2003), no. 5, 2095–2140.
[Na] M. Nazarov: Young's orthogonal form for Brauer's centralizer algebras. J. Algebra **182** (1996), no. 3, 664–693.
[Ro] R. Rouquier: q-Schur algebras and complex reflection groups. Mosc. Math. J. **8** (2008), no. 1, 119–158, 184.
[Se1] V. Serganova: On representations of the Lie superalgebra p(n). J. Algebra **258** (2002), no. 2, 615–630.
[Se2] V. Serganova: Finite dimensional representations of algebraic supergroups. Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Seoul, 2014.
[YL] G. Yang, Y. Li: Standardly based algebras and 0-Hecke algebras. J. Algebra Appl. **14** (2015), no. 10, 1550141, 13 pp.

K. Coulembier `kevin.coulembier@sydney.edu.au`
School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia